The Bible Champion

Volume XVIII. AUGUST, 1914. Number 1.

THE ARENA.

Is There a Place of Punishment Called Hell?

PROF. LUTHER T. TOWNSEND, LL.D.

On his last official Sunday in Washington, ex-President Taft spoke to the congregation of All Saints Unitarian Church and among other sayings was this announcement, repeated in substance by him on other occasions:

"It has always been a wonder to me why all the world is not Unitarian. I think all the world is verging in that direction."

But is it so very evident that the world is verging that way? Who, since the days of Channing has heard much of Unitarian overflow meetings? And should not a sane philosophy lead Mr. Taft not to stop with his wondering, but seek a rational explanation of the phenomenon that the world is not rushing headlong into the Unitarian church? As it seems to us, if our kindly disposed ex-President were more familiar with some of the awful phases of human life, his characteristic smile betimes would give way, and were his conscience as alert and reproachful as that of most sinful men he certainly would wonder less that the mass of men find nothing attractive in the unyielding, unmerciful non-belief of Unitarianism, and turn their faces to the atonement of Christ which, on condition of faith, repentance and righteous conduct has availed over and over again in freeing men from the sense of guilt, and is not that fact in human experience a rational indication that such freedom has really been secured and that for all such no hell is possible here or hereafter? (John viii., 36; Gal. v., 1.)

And if the supreme purpose of Christ in coming into the world was not as the gospel and orthodox theology teach, "to save sinners," then may he not as well not have come at all since his teaching and example, without affording relief, only increase human responsibility and despair?

And this also should be said that the great religious movements and uplifts during the Christian era began and were continued with the almost exclusive announcement of a gospel that rebukes sin and at the same time offers full forgiveness and salvation to the sinner if certain conditions are complied with?

Let this unique, and at present, too much neglected gospel be resolutely and incessantly proclaimed and nine-tenths of the despair and nine-tenths of the evils now threatening the very existence of human society and government would begin to diminish and churches would again be thronged.

Without taking time to review the great historic religious revivals in support of what we are saying,* attention is called instead to a few representative cases of individual experience.

The story of Jerry McAuley is in point and, though familiar, will bear a brief repeating. At an early age he began stealing. At nineteen he was sentenced to Sing Sing for a term of fifteen years and six months. There, under the preaching of a converted prize fighter, named Gardner, McAuley was converted and began to speak of what Christ had done for his soul. There followed, among the prisoners, a remarkable religious revival. By reason of this and for good behavior, McAuley in 1864 was pardoned by Governor Dix. Later he fell, and this second sinful career as often is the case, was worse than the first. In the neighborhood where he lived he became a terror to every one, even to stalwart policemen.

After a debauch that was well nigh his last he again offered his heart to Christ who had pity and gave him assurance that

* See Supernatural Factor in Revivals, pp. 22-59.

he was fully pardoned. McAuley never again forsook the path of righteousness. Beginning in a humble way he established and conducted one of the most noteworthy missions this world has known—the Water street, New York City Mission, that still bears his name. His message first and last was that Christ through his atonement and the shedding of his blood can completely save from sin and from sinning. It was by heeding this message that hundreds upon hundreds of poor outcasts, thieves and drunkards were redeemed in the Water street mission and became respectable and honored citizens, some of whom have been eminent, as active Christian workers.

Was, therefore, the cross of Christ in case of McAuley and in that of his converted thieves and drunkards a failure? Has like work ever been done by the white flag or the black flag of modern Unitarian free religion?

After McAuley's death the Water Street Mission passed under the superintendency of the late Col. Samuel Hopkins Hadley. The success that followed his administration was so remarkable that Christian workers, some from far away, visited the mission to study what was doing there, among whom was a no less distinguished prelate than Dr. Peploe of St. Paul's Cathedral, London.

During the twenty years of Hadley's service it is estimated that no fewer than seventy-five thousand persons announced in those meetings their intention of leading a Christian life. Many of these became noted evangelists and Christian workers in the home field and also in distant parts of the world.

We would not be uncharitable but think we speak within bounds when saying that all the Unitarian and Universalist clergymen in Christendom put together, first and last, to whom may be added those who in professedly orthodox pulpits have been preaching of late "a progressive and evasive orthodoxy," cannot begin to show such a harvest of saved men as those gathered by McAuley and Hadley in that Water Street New York Mission.

A few words about Hadley's conversion may be of interest as they clearly make for the point before us. The account given by himself is as follows:

"On Tuesday evening, April 18, 1882, I sat in a saloon in Harlem, a homeless, friendless, dying drunkard. I had pawned or sold everything that would bring a drink. I could not sleep unless I was dead drunk. I had not eaten food for days, and for four nights preceding I had suffered with delirium tremens, from midnight till morning. I had often said, 'I will never be a tramp; I will never be cornered; for when that time comes, if it ever does, I will find a home in the bottom of the river!' But the Lord so ordered it that when that time did come I was not able to walk one-quarter of the way to the river. As I sat there thinking, I seemed to feel some great and mighty Presence. I did not know then what it was. I did learn afterwards that it was Jesus, the sinner's Friend. I said I would never take another drink if I died in the street; and I felt as though that would happen before morning. I went to the nearest station house, and had myself locked up. I was placed in a narrow cell, and it seemed as though all the demons that could find room came in that place with me. This was not all the company I had. That dear Spirit that came to me in the saloon was present and said, 'Pray!' I did pray, and though I did not feel any great help, I kept on praying.

"As soon as I was able to leave my cell I was taken to the police court and remanded back to the cell. I was finally released, and went to Jerry McAuley's Mission. There I saw the apostle to the drunkard and the outcast, Jerry McAuley. He rose and told the simple story of his salvation, and I found myself saying, 'I wonder if God can save me!'"

Colonel Hadley then repeats the prayer offered by McAuley, which was this:

"Dear Saviour, won't you look down in pity on these poor souls? They need your help, Lord; they can't get along without it! Blessed Jesus, these poor sinners have got themselves into a bad hole. Won't you help them out? Speak to them, Lord! Do, for Jesus' sake! Amen!"

After being urged to pray for himself, and refusing at first, he at length offered this prayer of only six words: "Oh, Jesus can you help me?" What followed that prayer is thus described by Colonel Hadley:

"Never with mortal tongue can I describe that moment. Although up to that moment my soul had been filled with indescribable gloom, I felt the glorious bright-

ness of the noonday sun shine into my heart; I felt I was a free man. Oh, the precious feeling of safety, of freedom, of resting on Jesus! I felt that Christ, with all His brightness and power, had come into my life; that indeed old things had passed away, and all things had become new."

Without pausing to make comment upon this experience and testimony we call attention to the case of John G. Woolley. He had been a brilliant lawyer with a practice of $50,000 a year. But through drink he became a miserable sot. His broken-hearted mother while on her death bed pled with him to reform. This he promised to do. He attended her funeral, but was drunk almost before the emblems of the funeral had been removed from the house of the dead mother.

Then he went down as low as one could go without plunging into the pit of perdition. One night he wandered into a prayer meeting. He was there told that the Lord Jesus could save him. He stretched forth his trembling hand, Christ took it and John G. Woolley became one of the most efficient Christian temperance evangelists that this world has known, whose converts were numbered by thousands.

Not men alone, but women, from the time when Christ forgave fallen women in the streets of Jerusalem, have turned through faith in the atonement from the paths of hell to those that lead upward to heaven.

There is perhaps no need of sketching in full the career of the woman who, amid the fallen, bore the name of "Nan." She was keeper of a house in which men and women were lured into infamy, out of which they escaped only when their ruin had been accomplished. This miserable creature was halted in her life of iniquity and in a rescue mission in Philadelphia was redeemed from sin and sinning. Of her salvation and the effectual evangelical means through which it was accomplished she never had a doubt, and not doubting she was able to lead others in large numbers to the fold of Christ.

Now these cases, that of McAuley, the wretched drunkard and criminal, that of Hadley and Woolley, the debased sots, and that of the prostitute Nan, are representative. Others by scores and hundreds more or less like them could be cited.

The questions therefore that by right may be put to Unitarians and other free religionists are these: How many such criminals have their methods redeemed from the hells of this world? And did not these miserable sinners, some of whom were in possession of more than ordinary intelligence, know by what means and in whose name they were saved and by what means they were enabled to lead others in the path of redemption. They testified that they tried to save themselves but failed again and again, until a prayer to the Lord Jesus Christ gave them hope and the strength of a *Divine Presence.* Is not here a religious phenomenon that challenges the investigation of every doubter? Or shall the testimony of these redeemed souls be disregarded and that of men who are quite destitute of any evangelical religious experience and who antagonize it, be accredited and accepted? And must these redeemed souls go to hell and suffer there for their past transgressions and iniquity though Christ has pronounced his pardon and blessing upon them? Or shall these redeemed sinners because Christ died for them be ashamed in this or any other world to look him in the face? Rather the desire of every redeemed soul, on entering the portals of another world will be to see the face of this Infinite Friend and Saviour who laid down his life for sinners and who did not hesitate to assume a divine prerogative when he said, "Be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." —to see that face if they can see nothing else in heaven is the foremost hope of all those who have believed in Jesus Christ and have felt the power of his salvation.

Most men are sober and honest when facing death and when making their wills. Shakespeare's will contains these words:

"I commend my soul into the hands of God, my Creator, hoping and assuredly believing, through the only merits of Jesus Christ my Saviour, to be made partaker of life everlasting."

The following is from the will of Charles Dickens:

"I commit my soul to the mercy of God, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and exhort my dear children humbly to try to guide themselves by the teachings of the New Testament."

The will of one of the brainiest men of this century, the late J. Pierpont Morgan, has for its introduction these words:

"I commit my soul into the hands of my Saviour, in full confidence that, having redeemed it and washed it in His most precious blood, He will present it faultless before the throne of my Heavenly Father; and I entreat my children to maintain and defend, at all hazard, and at any cost of personal sacrifice, the blessed doctrine of complete atonement of sin through the blood of Jesus Christ once offered, and through that alone."

Here are three men who may well command the respect at least of every intelligent Unitarian—men who were not ashamed in life or in death to confess their firm conviction that the blood of Jesus Christ does atone for sin, and these men are representative of hundreds and thousands of others who take rank among the most intelligent men in Christendom. Is not here too a religious phenomenon that may well challenge the attention of such Unitarians as haughtily demand that punishment in full for sin and transgression shall be inflicted upon all who have strayed from the path of rectitude?

The words of the apostle addressed to the Corinthians, noted for their culture and conceit are suggested:

"The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

The late Matthew Arnold, not long before his death paid the following tribute to the faith of Christian believers that quite fully offsets the underratings and negations of such teachers as Dr. Elliot and his friend Dr. Cummings: "Men are not mistaken in thinking that (orthodox) Christianity has done them good in loving it, in wishing to listen to those who will talk to them about what they love, and will talk of it with admiration and gratitude, not contempt and hatred. Christianity is truly the greatest and happiest stroke ever yet made for human perfection. Men do not err, they are on firm ground of experience, when they say that they have found Christianity to be something incomparably beneficent."

Are therefore these recent apostles of free thought perfectly sure that "the cross as a symbol of the Christian religion is a failure? . . . and that the Christian world is tired of the old mistaken religion of the cross"? Unless these men are sure, as certainly they are not and cannot be except on condition of a change of heart and attitude (John vii. 17), then they would better be in no great haste to take away the last and most blessed hope of a dying world.

There is another phase of this subject that perhaps at present is neither of increasing nor diminishing interest and value. Reference is had to the experiences and visions of those departing this life. To be sure, it is not clear how much can be attributed to the fore-gleamings of Christian men when death's shadows have gathered, still the faith and confidence sometimes expressed, carry with them a large hope. To a friend who had said to Bishop Gilbert Haven when on his death-bed, "Good night," the bishop replied, "Good night; but it will be good morning when we next meet."

"I am going home; good-bye," were the last words of Phillips Brooks to a circle of friends standing at his death-bed.

Mr. Moody when dying was heard to say in a perfectly calm and low voice: "There is no valley. This is bliss. This is glorious. This is my coronation. I have been looking forward to it. I have just been within the gates. I have seen the children's faces. Earth is receding; heaven is opening; God is calling. I must up and away."

And what reader of the New Testament has not been stirred, if not thrilled, with the foregleam of one of the greatest minds of the age in which he lived, if not of any age since then? These were his words to a young friend whom he greatly loved:

"For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of

righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day." (2 Tim. iv. 6-8.)

Ah! no! We cannot tell how much these fore-gleamings mean. Few have them and live long enough to tell all they have seen.

Nor do we know all that the fore-shadows of other dying men signify: "I am doomed to perdition by the judgments of Almighty God," were the dying words of Sir Thomas Scott. "I am suffering the pangs of the damned," said the dying Talleyrand to the French king who had asked about his health. "O, the insufferable pangs of hell!" exclaimed Sir Francis Newport, and, falling back, was dead.

Fore-gleamings! Fore-bodings! Would not men better live the life that invites the one and escapes the other?

And in all kindness may we not add that while those who are destitute of faith in the deity of Christ often have faced death with composure because of a hope for release from pain, weariness, trouble, or some other of the ills of life, yet they never have been known to give expressions of triumphant joy for what they expect beyond the gates of death. An article by the late Prof. George E. Ellis of Harvard Divinity School (Unitarian) written when eighty years of age and published in the *Unitarian Magazine* (October, 1894), contains the following confessions:

"Confining myself to the natural realm of experiences and belief among a class who have vastly increased in number and in free and frank utterance in recent years, I may say that, after much of confidential intimacy with aged persons in their infirmities and decay, I have inferred that the desire for and the belief in a future life are by no means so universally strong or clear as is generally affirmed. Rather is there an acquiescence of spirit . . . . . Familiar enough to us are the cases in which the full belief is reduced, suspended and clouded, with disinclinations and disavowals. There rise in my professional recallings 'last utterances' of three aged persons in their lingerings in life, varying in their furnishings, lot, and culture. All of them had been blameless, useful, and esteemed, each with his full share in the good and ill of existence, all serene and patient. 'I am waiting for what comes next,' said one of them. The words of the second were, 'As to life here or anywhere, I have seen enough of it. I want no more.' The third, whose lifework as a master-mechanic may be inferred from his reference to uses of the spirit-level and plummet, said, as he lay on his last bed, 'Life seems very different as you look at it perpendicularly or horizontally,'—which means whether you are standing and moving in the world's concourse and affairs, or alone, still and prostrate.' For myself I may say that I, in hearty accord with the first sentiment, am waiting to see—'what comes next.'"

Here, to say the least, there is nothing like a rapturous departure for this eminent divine, from this world to another.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, of buoyant spirit, scattering good cheer on every hand, was, however, far from being satisfied, in his Unitarian outlook as to the future. He says: "We may talk much of the shadows, but when it comes to going out among them and laying hold of them with the hand of faith we are not of that excursion."

James Russell Lowell, calm as the sky, and of recognized piety, was of the same mind as that of Holmes, Ellis and of other Unitarians in large number. Speaking of Lowell, Mr. Howells says: His hold upon a belief in a life after death weakened with his years." Tenderly pathetic is what he wrote after the death of his daughter:

> "Console if you will I can bear it,
> 'Tis a well meant alms of breath;
> But not all the preaching since Adam
> Can make death other than death."

There is something, however, though not found in the preaching to which the poet had listened, that does assuredly "make death other than death." By the testimony of thousands upon thousands it is established beyond rational question that death loses its sting, the grave its victory, and hell its terror, when faith and Jesus Christ is triumphant.

And why, it may be asked, are not the observations of Dr. Ellis and his personal experience and these confessions of Holmes, of Lowell, and of many others, precisely what would be expected as an outcome in case of those who do not believe that Jesus Christ "came into the world to save sinners"? Or how could joy be expected to find its place in the hearts of those who pull down the cross and demand punishment for every sin committed? Or how could our Roman Catholic neighbors who

find an insufficient atonement in the cross of Christ be expected to approach the fires of their purgatory (purgation from sin) without a cringing dread of "what is to come next"?

For the sake, therefore, of poor suffering humanity let the cross of Christ stand for what it always has stood and continue to be the most glorious symbol of God's mercy and of human redemption that this world ever has witnessed.

Nor can it well be supposed that the cross will signify less or that the name of Christ will be less transcendent in a future existence than it is now. Orthodox theology teaches that if the relentless finger of the universe of things should be pointed at the past record of a redeemed soul, or if the memory and conscience of such a soul should attempt a recount of the transgressions of a lifetime, then the majestic personality of Christ instantly would overshadow the record as it does here on earth and fill the soul "with joy unspeakable." Orthodox theology also teaches that the words, "Come ye blessed of my father," will give the same assurance and composure on the day of judgment that they do now, and that Christ and the cross for penitent and redeemed souls will be a complete and perpetual *diversion*. And it is beyond all question that history, first and last shows that the wisdom of men in their efforts and searchings have not yet discovered any so effective diversion as the name and cross of Christ afford. Or to state the fact in another form,—every student of history is confronted with this psychological phenomenon that the pangs of remorse in the human heart have "survived all sorts of diversions save only the cross of Christ." And this conviction that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners and that he personally does this in case of every truly penitent sinner is the meaning of Christianity. To deny this empties the gospel of all that is worth while.

And that the Infinite Saviour and Friend who in this world has thrown his mantle of peace and forgiveness over countless penitent and justified human souls and whose marvellous *Presence* has diverted men's thoughts from personal guilt and unworthiness is the most rational assurance known among men that he will do no less for the forgiven and justified sinner when standing before the bar of justice in the courts of another world.

Question of Numbers.

As to the number of the redeemed there is for the Bible student no occasion for despondency. According to the New Testament they will constitute great multitudes:

"And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. vii. 11.)

"For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." (Heb. ii., 10.)

"In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." (Acts x. 35.)

"And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe and tongue, and people, and nation." (Rev. v. 9.)

"After these things I saw, and behold a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne of God and before the Lamb, arrayed in white robes (a symbol of purity) and palms in their hands (a symbol of victory)."

There are also encouraging announcements that before the end of the present dispensation, vast numbers are to acknowledge the Christian faith and that entire nations will bow to the scepter of Christ.

But does some one ask, How can these statements be harmonized with the words of Jesus when speaking of the "little flock," "the narrow way," "the straitened gate," the few that find it, and the "many called and few chosen"?

It will be seen, if the context of these passages is carefully studied, that they refer primarily to the early history of Christianity and accurately state the facts then existing. Comparatively few during Christ's lifetime entered the narrow way; few were

then chosen; the flock was then small. And it also should be borne in mind that the words many and few are relative terms. Many cities have been destroyed by earthquakes and floods, but they are few as compared with those that have escaped such devastation. There are many criminals in our jails and prisons, but they are few as compared with those who are not there. Clergymen now and then go wrong, but they are few as compared with the many who sometimes midst peculiarly fierce temptations remain pure as the angels in heaven.

And the hope of every Christian, a hope not altogether destitute of Bible support, is that righteous and redeemed intelligences in the future world will outnumber those who are lost by as great majorities as those who are not criminals and who are not in prisons and jails, outnumber those who are.

There are many demons awaiting the doom of Hell—their name is "legion" (Mark v. 9), but they are few when compared with the angels of light. Christ's words are suggestive, when he assured his disciples that a request from his lips would bring not one legion, but "more than twelve legions of angels" for his defense (Matt. xxvi. 53). And the hosts of angels foreseen in the vision of the Apostle John were said to be "ten thousand times ten thousands and thousands of thousands" (Rev. v. 11). Hell, not heaven, will be the dreary, lonesome place.

There will be among the hosts of heaven little children like those whom Christ when on earth received and loved. "Of such is the kingdom of God" (or the kingdom of God belongs to such) are the words of the Redeemer (Luke xviii. 16). And other words from those same lips are these: "It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." (Matt. xviii. 14.)

There will be those there who reared in the nurture and admonition of the Lord did not far depart from that way as the years went by. There will be among the redeemed, patriarchs from among the Jews whom God loved and saved long before Jesus appeared on earth. There will also be patriarchs, men of faith and righteousness, from all lands, from Assyria, Arabia, China, India, Ancient Greece and Rome, and wherever else men have lived who, though without a knowledge of either the prophetic or historic Jesus, and without a written revelation, loved and served God as best they could, accepting with all their hearts the ideal and essential Christ whom God revealed to their consciousness as the reward of their obedience. (John vii. 17.)

"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves." (Rom. ii. 14.)

Listen to one of these noble men, Epictitus, whom we call heathen:

"I dare to look up to God and say, Deal with me in the future as thou wilt; I am of the same mind as thou art; I am thine; I refuse nothing that pleases thee; lead me where thou wilt; clothe me in any dress thou choosest." (Epictitus, Book II, Ch. xvi.)

The words of the immortal Lincoln come to mind and are doubtless what multitudes of honest, upright men outside our churches would say should they give expression to their thoughts:

"Whenever any Church will inscribe over its altar, as its sole qualification for membership, the Saviour's condensed statement of the substance of both Law and Gospel, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself,' that Church I will join with all my heart, and all my soul.

What reason have we for supposing that Christ demands other requirements than those implied in this confession by the great emancipator. And fortunately we are left without misgiving that the praying and consecrated soul of Abraham Lincoln had accepted the personal Christ.

In an interview with Hon. Newton Bateman, who was superintendent of public instruction for the state of Illinois, Mr. Lincoln gave utterance to his belief in the righteousness of the position that he had taken against slavery, in these words: "I know I am right, because I know that liberty is right, for Christ teaches it, and Christ is God."

And so of others—Universalists who have followed and worshipped Christ though

mistaken in believing that he is to save all men. And likewise Unitarians who have failed to place Jesus of Nazareth where he belongs but who have adored and loved the Christ life, the essential Christ with every fibre of their being, will find their place after the judgment nowhere else except in heaven.

Christ once lifted the veil that hides the other world and told his disciples what on the greatest of days would there be heard. The invitation was, *"Come":*

"For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

Of such as these who on earth were righteous and Christlike without knowing it, there may be millions and billions.

And beside these there will be broken-hearted sinners without number, like those whom Christ forgave when on earth—the fallen woman of Jerusalem, the thief on the cross, and penitent prodigal who returned from his wandering to the father's house—and those saved in rescue missions and in Salvation Army barracks—all these will make multitudes that no man can number. There comes a thrill of joy when one thinks that far more perhaps will enter the heavenly world than even "Institutional Christianity" has ever dared to dream.

But the awful truth remains that there is one dark world in the universe where Satan and demons and those of the human family who are vile and cruel, where Pharisees and hypocrites and other unbelievers will be consigned and judicially punished. One world, upon whose night no sun will rise, and where remorse, wailing and gnashing of teeth will be heard. "Its people, few, compared with the infinite numbers of the universe, are never to increase, never to decrease, while God endures."—A memorial world of what sin has done, a spectacle that will hold in check a universe against future rebellion and transgression.

And everything in the nature of man, in the providence of God, and in the divine administration, conspires to produce and deepen an impression more terrible than any other, that those lost souls are never to be released from the tyranny of that appalling habitation for which they have fitted themselves and to which they will be commanded to depart. (Matt. xxv. 41.)

But hear this, fellow voyager to eternity: Though God is a being who loathes, hates and must punish unforgiven sin here and hereafter; though he cannot be just and holy and perfect if he does not do this; though the ponderous hammers and jagged wheels of his physical universe, if men are careless, will crush or tear them into fragments any moment, yet amid all the perils that lie in wait, amid all that is seen and all that is unseen, there is still heard, from the heavens above, and from the earth beneath, and from the everlasting soul of things, the tender, loving, repeated, pathetic entreaty of a Father, asking every sorrowing child of his to repent, look up, sin no more, and accept the offer of mercy symbolized by the cross, with Christ upon it.

But why do men not listen? Why this hesitation? What meaning has this astounding arrogance and hardness of the human heart? IS IT A FORESHADOW?

You cannot bind up the literature of any other people, making one organic volume, as the Bible is bound up.

"I know the Bible is inspired, because it finds me at greater depths of my being than any other book."—*Coleridge.*

The Bible must be the invention, either of good men or angels, bad men or devils, or of God. Which?

The Bible is the one book which claims "God for its author, unmixed truth for its contents, and salvation for its end."

God's Prophet.

Rev. W. B. Riley, D.D.

"As they departed, Jesus began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they that wear soft clothing are in kings' houses. But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea! *** Verily, I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist." (Matt. ii., 7-9, 11.)

To three volumes, read during one week, I acknowledge special obligation. According to one of these the prophet of God is "an educated man" who goes with the drift of his times: and who fraternizes with his fellow ministers without reference to the creeds that are with them; a man who sees no difference between Trinitarianism and Unitarianism, but believes them the two wings of faith that ought to "beat in unison" to make the "flight" of the church possible. When I had finished such a definition of the Prophet my soul hungered for something substantial, and that I found in the two other volumes to which I have already referred.

As I approach, therefore, this great theme "God's Prophet" I feel impelled to speak alike by the sting of liberalism on the one side and the inspiration of Scripturalism on the other.

According to our text John the Baptist was a prophet of God, never surpassed. Let us study The Man, The Mission, and his Message.

The Man.

Paintings of John the Baptist are multitudinous. In the judgment of the great masters, his face occupies a place second only to that of Christ. You will note, however, that we have no portrait of his person by the pen of inspiration.

There are, nevertheless, three great statements shining forth from the sacred page. He was a Man: He was sent from God: He was a great prophet.

He was a man. "There came a man." Angels might announce the birth of Jesus; a bright star might direct to His manger-cradle, but God selected *a man* to announce the Master's ministry. The office of a prophet has never been committed to another. People sometimes speak of the men who have "honored" the prophet's office, and mention Peter and Paul, or Clement or Calvin, or Luther or John Knox, or Wiclif, or Huss, or Edwards, or Spurgeon or Parker. The truth lies in the opposite direction. Each of these men lived in the unending wonder that God should have honored him by an appointment to the office of prophet. As Jowett says of Paul: "He seemed to catch his breath every time he thought of his mission. Next to the infinite love of his Saviour, and the amazing glory of his own salvation, his wonder is arrested and nourished by the surpassing glory of his own vocation." Paul voiced what every true preacher from his day has felt when he said: "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." If flesh and blood is denied inheritance in the Kingdom of God, it has enjoyed an unspeakable glory in the privilege of proclaiming the King of God.

Dr. George A. Gordon tells us: "There is a tradition in England to the effect that when an Englishman has three sons he selects the bravest and educates him for the navy; the next, if he seems stupid, but brave, he educates for the army; and the third, if he seems to be good for nothing, he prepares for the church." God's method with his ministers is exactly the opposite. He selects the brightest and best; but by putting them into the office of prophet, honors them a thousand times beyond their deserts. Not an archangel but must have coveted the honor bestowed upon the man—John the Baptist.

He was sent from God! The true prophet always is. The remark, "Congregations mould preachers" is all too true! Let us put over against it the converse, and more blessed truth, viz., *that God makes prophets!* The remark, "Great preachers

will appear when the churches demand them," is only true in the light of its context. But great prophets appear when God appoints them. It is, in ministers, sometimes true that the "congregations get what they want." It is always true that God sends only the prophets the people need. In the language of Jowett: "There is a door into this sheep-fold, and there is some other way." A man may enter the ministry as a result of merely personal calculation; choose it as a profession,—considering its social distinction, its chance for cultivated leisure, coveted leadership, and attractive publicity. His constraining motive may be ambition; his desire—international fame; his hope—a name to live.

Such motives never made a prophet. Truly: "The call of the Eternal must ring through the rooms of his soul as clearly as the sound of the morning bell rings through the valleys of Switzerland, calling the peasants to prayer and praise. . . . the candidate for the ministry must move like a man in secret bonds. Necessity is laid upon him. His choice is not a preference among alternatives. He has no alternative. There is only one clear call sounding forth as the imperative summons of God." John heard that call! Let no man enter the prophet's office who has not heard it!

The thing that made Amos a prophet was not "insight, sincerity, sympathy, and natural speech," but holy fire kindled in the herdman's heart by the Holy Ghost; the impelling motive of his ministry was not that he thought it "worth while to strive to become great"; but personal experience: "The Lord took him as he followed the flock, and said, "Go prophesy." The thing that made Isaiah a preacher was not his ability to give "luminous interpretations of the life and work of the Lord, and the moral history of human beings, nor yet his "out-cry for abiding inspirations in the service of the ideal": but the experience that came to him, when in sorrow, over the death of King Uzziah, God spoke to him, saying: "Who will go for me?"

The thing that made Jeremiah a prophet was not that he had a desire to be "lifted to higher levels of thought, sustained by purer motives and set going on a mountain path"; but rather the circumstance that "before he came forth out of the womb, God sanctified him and ordained him a preacher." The thing that made Jonah successful in the street of Nineveh was neither his native eloquence nor his wavering courage, nor his impelling convictions; but the voice of the Lord ringing in his ears: "Go to Nineveh, that great city, and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee." The thing that made Paul a prophet of God was not his education at the feet of Gamaliel, nor his legal eloquence, nor even his mastery of the Old Testament Scriptures, but his Divine ordination "as a preacher and an apostle, a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity." The schools of the twentieth century are making many ministers: every prophet of God holds office by Divine appointment. As was John, so every true prophet is another "man sent from God."

He was a great prophet! The declaration is "among them that are born of woman, there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist." What made him great? The answer to that question may mark the way for his successors, and it may furthermore instruct the hearts of the people so that they shall discern the man of God when he appears. Newell Dwight Hillis says truthfully: "Every prophet has three characteristics. He is a seer and sees clearly. He is a great heart and feels deeply. He is a hero and dares valiantly."

Apply these tests to John! He rises to meet every one of them. Apply them to the modern prophets; the majority fall before them. School valedictories do not always give promise of spiritual vision. Superb culture is not always associated with pronounced sympathy. The royal road of learning does not always lead to love of righteousness. You can have an educated Ingersoll—a prophet of infidelity,—and an uneducated Moody—a prophet of God. This is not to inveigh against education! God's prophets have always been its patrons and apostles; but it is to remind a scholastic and egotistical age of the Scriptural fact that Christ has not as yet surrenderd the prerogative of making "prophets and apostles, and evangelists and pastors and teachers," to the public schools, and state uni-

versities, nor even to the skeptical professors who teach a Jericho theology under cover of Christian denominationalism. There is just as much difference between the most noted minister the schools can make and the prophet of God, as there was between a Theodore Parker and a Joseph Parker; just as much difference as there is between a Burnam Foster and a John Foster. The public will pardon the personalities in the interest of pointed truth.

The Mission.

Again let the first chapter of John instruct us. The limitations of a single discourse do not make possible the full elaboration of all points in "a prophet's mission"; but the Scriptures of our study make clear three of them. He is to prepare the way for Christ; He is to proclaim the Word of God; He will, incidentally, reprove the enemies of Jesus.

He is to prepare the way for Christ. "The same came for a witness, that he might bear witness of the light, that all men might believe through him. He was not the light, but came that he might bear witness of the light." His own conception of his own ministry was expressed after this manner: "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord."

John the Baptist is the unbreakable link between the Old Testament formalities and the New Testament faith. You will remember Jesus, in answer to a lawyer's question, reminded his auditors of God's promise: "I will send unto them prophets and apostles" (Luke xi. 49). John the Baptist effectively fills both offices. He was a prophet of the Old Testament type, born after its time; and an apostle of the New, born before its time. By an appeal to the word of his predecessors—the Old Testament prophets—he was to point to the Lamb of God, coming now to take away the sins of the world, and thereby prepare the way for Him. In John was fulfilled again the description of the prophet which had become proverbial with Isaiah in olden times, namely, when a man inquired of God, they said: "Come now, let us go to the seer: for he that is now called a Prophet was beforetime called a Seer" (1 Sam. ix 9). As a Phophet, he was a Seer. He saw the words of his brother phophets fulfilled; he proclaimed the first coming of Christ; he said "The sin-bearer is at hand—Repent."

Jowett has a fine and original passage, interpreting the prophetic description of our Master's mission, as recorded in Isaiah (lxi. 1), "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me: because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek: he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." He says this: "Look at the cardinal words in the passage, 'preach,' 'heal,' 'deliver,' 'give liberty,' 'proclaim.' Can we extract the common virtue of the words? Have they any general significance? Is there any common denominator? May we not say that in all these varied words there is a pervasive sentiment and purpose of emancipation? Are they not all suggestive of an opening, an emergence, a release? Let us review the words, 'Sent to preach'; to give the open vision of divine grace to those whose thought is darkly bounded and imprisoned. 'To heal,' to give the grace of comfort to those who are crushed beneath the unintelligible weight of sorrow and care." (He should have added, "and sickness"); 'to deliver the captive'; to give the open spaces of a noble freedom to all who languish in any form of unholy servitude. "To set at liberty them that are bruised"; to give open passage to all who are lying with broken wing or broken limb, to all whose powers have been shattered by disappointment and defeat. "To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord"; to announce the open door in the present hour, and to say that by God's grace there is a present right of way from the deepest gloom of the soul into the radiant light of acceptance with God. In all these words there appears to be this general sense of emergence and release. There is an opening of mind, an opening of heart, an opening of eyes, an opening of doors. In every word the iron gate swings

back and there is the sound of the song of freedom."

Yes, but the path must be prepared for His feet if He is to come and loose our feet from the stocks. The prophet of God must unhinge the gates of infidelity which hold Christ back from human hearts and human society, that He in turn may break the iron doors of prison houses and bring the captives free. The prophet must proclaim the "coming in power" of the Christ that He in turn may proclaim liberty to the captive. The prophet of God must release the truth that the Son of God may bind up the broken-hearted; and the prophet of God must make known a millenium that the Good Tidings may reach the "meek" that they are yet to "inherit the earth."

If John the Baptist was a pathfinder for the Saviour, the true prophet of the twentieth century will be a pathfinder for the Messiah, for the way of Christ is not only to give Good Tidings to the meek, bind up the broken-hearted, proclaim liberty to the captive, and the opening of the door to them that are bound, but it is His also "to proclaim the year of Jehovah forever; and the year of vengeance of our God."

In John's day the true prophet prepared the way for the first appearance of Jesus—the Day's Man—the Redeemer from sin; in this day it is the prophet's business to prepare the way for the second appearance of Jesus, whose coming is to be "without sin unto salvation."

He is to proclaim the Word of God. Again, we may accept John as a sample of God's "sent one." He defended his ministry by an appeal to the sacred text of Isaiah. Only false prophets refuse or fail to find the defense of their ministry in the same inspired Scriptures. The modern ministers who have yielded to the drift of their times and no longer feel the necessity of bolstering their positions by an appeal to the Bible, were clearly anticipated and described by the great Jeremiah. Of them Jeremiah said: "They shall deny Jehovah, and say it is not He; neither shall evil come upon us, neither shall we see sword or famine; and the prophets shall become wind, and THE WORD is not in them."

Dr. I. M. Haldeman's series of questions then are not inappropriate as applied to the Liberal's "ideal prophet."

"What do you think of a preacher who stands in the pulpit of a Christian church and in the name of Christ denies his virgin birth?

"What do you think of a preacher who by that denial puts a bar-sinister on the name of the mother of Jesus and sends her down the ages as nothing better than a fallen woman?

"What do you think of a preacher who by that denial sends Jesus Christ before the gaze of his audience as a fatherless bastard, as an illegitimate son?

What do you think of a preacher who denies the death of Christ as an atoning sacrifice and makes that cross no better than a common murder or a brutal barbarism?

"What do you think of a preacher who denies that Jesus Christ rose from the dead in the body in which he died; a preacher who preaches that Jesus Christ is nothing more than a bodiless ghost, a formless phantom?

"What do you think of a preacher who denies that on yonder throne is sitting a glorified, immortal man, upholding all things by the word of his power? The God who became man, the man who was, and is none other than God?

"What do you think of a preacher who laughs at the doctrine of hell and testifies that men are not so much in danger of hell as they are of the theology which proclaims it; preachers who teach that all men are by nature the sons of God and that no son of man can be lost?

"What do you think of the preacher who teaches that the great work of the church is saving the world socially and not individually; that the true call of the church is social and not personal redemption?

"What do you think of the preacher who stumbles at the miracles of the Bible but is ready to go on all-fours after spiritualism; who would consider himself childish if he accepted the stories of Genesis, but who is ready to sit the night out in a mediumistic seance waiting for communications from the unseen world?

"What do you think of the preacher who is not certain that the Bible gives clear statements concerning the hereafter, but is ready to shout himself hoarse over the fact that scientists have now actually concluded that man has a soul?

"What do you think of a preacher who protests against bibliolatry, against surrendering completely to the written Word, and yet looks upon every utterance of Herbert Spencer as the very breath of the Almighty?

"And yet these are the kind of men that

Jericho colleges are sending us, asking us to ordain them, open our pulpits to them, give our churches to their sway. Men who spend four or five years in college that they may scientifically demonstrate that the body of Jesus of Nazareth still mingles with the dust of Palestine."

Truly, Amos, the unschooled herdsman, was both a prophet and a seer, for looking upon the twentieth century, he said: "Behold the day cometh, saith the Lord, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord" (viii. 13). Throughout the world now there is a great hue and cry about the poor progress that the Church is making; and annual reports of some of the greatest denominations are showing decline in numbers, and men are saying: "What does it mean?" We are inclined to think it means that the Church of Jesus Christ is suffering the affliction of corporate wealth on the one side and a clerical infidelity on the other: and that her judgment is akin to that which in Isaiah's day was visited upon Judah, of whom he said: "Jehovah will cut off from Israel head and tail. . . . The ancient and honorable, he is the head, and the prophet that teacheth lies, he is the tail" (ix. 14-15). "If any man preach unto you any Gospel other than which you received" he is a lying prophet—a needless caudal appendage to the church (Gal. i. 9).

Incidentally he reproved the enemies of Christ. It is a significant phrase, describing those who questioned John "they came from the Pharisees." The Pharisees were Unitarians every one; they believed in God the Father, they Rejected Christ—the Son. What a liberal writer describes as "the fever of evangelical fervor" could not be combined with their cold creed without producing a case of spiritual ague; and John—the prophet of God—advised no such endeavor. With Paul, John held that "the believer hath no part with the infidel" save to "reprove, rebuke and exhort."

It is a time when the Church of Jesus Christ ought to join with D. Wortman in his petition:

"God of the prophets! bless the prophets' sons;
Elijah's mantle o'er Elisha cast;
Each age its solemn task may claim but once;
Make each a nobler, stronger than the last!

"Anoint them prophets! Make their ears attent
To Thy divinest speech; their hearts awake
To human need; their lips make eloquent
To assure the right, and every evil break."

The Message.

It is doubtful if a more comprehensive putting of the Prophet's message appears on any page of the Bible than this of John i. 6-34. The prophet's one great message is compassed in three words — "Lord," "Light" and "Life."

Christ—the Lord, is the phrase that refers to His deity. "Christ—the Lord" is the phrase we commonly employ to describe his *essential deity.* Our text justifies it. Of Him it says: "The Word was God." "No man hath seen God at any time; the Only Begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." The people who propose to preach Jehovah, after having put Jesus aside, are opposed by every true prophet, for the prophets are one with their Lord in the teaching: "He that hath not the Son, the same hath not the Father." "No man cometh unto the Father but by the Son."

If Christ was right in His interpretation of the Old Testament, no prophet from Moses' day until Malachi, failed of the message of the Coming One. Of the Old Testament Scriptures He said: "Search the Scriptures, for in them you think you have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me." Truly they do! You can take a page from any part of the Old Testament, and by careful study you will find upon it the face of Christ; and in that face you can see God, for He is the "express image of the Father." A great preacher has a quotation from Ruskin: "If you will take a square inch out of any one of Turner's skies, you will find the infinite in it," and then that preacher remarks: "If men would

take any square inch out of God's Word he would find the suggestion of the Throne of God and the Lamb." And if we are God's prophets, preaching God's truth, we will find the same.

Christ the Light. "John came for a witness that he might bear witness of the light." Christ was the Light, "even the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." The great Dr. Dale never made a more sage remark than this: "The real truth is that while Christ came to preach the Gospel, His chief object in coming was that there might be a Gospel to preach." Sir Edwin Arnold wrote his poem, "The Light of Asia," and made a vain endeavor to lift Buddha to the level of Jesus. Apparently he repented it, and while he made rather bungling work of the business, he attempted, at least, to give to men the proof of his repentance by writing another poem entitled "The Light of the World." He could describe but one—even Christ. He was the light which prophets saw, and of which they spake, saying: "I will also give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be made salvation unto the ends of the earth." (Isa. xlix. 6.)

According to our text, in that Lord and in that Light is *Life.*

Christ, then, is the Life. That is the prophet's message. The true prophet will never depart from the declaration: "There is none other name given under heaven and among men whereby we must be saved." The man who prefers the language of sociology to that of Scripture, who preaches "reformation" rather than "regeneration," and evolutionary biology rather than revolutionary new birth, takes issue with John, the greatest of prophets, and enters the arena of argument against Paul, who has determined "to know nothing among men save Jesus Christ and Him crucified," and forgets the great fact that only the Living One can create life, and only the One who is himself "Light" can enlighten others.

With one story let me conclude: It is that of a great thinker, who is reported to have looked one day upon a large audience of medical students, made up of hundreds of men. He took from his desk a letter, and as he opened it in their presence, he said: "Young gentlemen, I have here a letter from one of your number, in which he tells me the story of his life—a record of shame and sinful indulgence that makes me shudder even to look at the letter. At the conclusion of this fearful confession he asks, 'Can your God save such an one as I am?' Then, surveying his audience in silence for a full minute, Henry Drummond continued: 'When I came to Edinburgh this afternoon there was a beautiful fleecy cloud spreading itself like a thing of glory in the upper sky, and I said, "Oh, cloud, where did you come from? And the cloud said, 'I come from the slums and low places of the city. The sun of heaven reached down and lifted me up and transfigured me with his own shining.' After a solemn pause, he added further: "I do not know whether this young man is here or not, but if he is, I can say to him that my Saviour and my Master, Jesus Christ, can reach down to the lowest depths into which a human soul can sink, and can lift that soul up. Yes, he can lift you up, young man, until he shines in you and through you, and transfigures you with the light of his own love and glory."

Professionally, the speaker was an instructor of science; his delivery that day proved him to be a "Prophet of God."

When Christianity dispenses wholly with controversy it will be like a sleeping man—harmless and helpless. So it is, and ever will be. Controversy was the life of Paul's works—polite controversy, brotherly controversy; but strong in exposing error and building up the truth. The Epistles are full of controversy. Moreover, many of Christ's sayings were strictly controversial.—*Christian Advocate.*

"To attempt to add to, or improve on, the teaching of Christ seems vain and even arrogant. The discussions of theology are intensely interesting, no doubt: they are the science, but they are not the essence of religion. Theology is a branch of science: it is not religion. It is an exercise of the mind—religion of the heart."—*Lord Avebury.*

"Sermon on the Mound---by a Higher Critic"*

Examined by Jural Science

JUDGE FRANCIS J. LAMB.

A book of Advanced or Destructive Higher Criticism of the Bible is before the public. The author in his preface speaks of the "need of a text book of the higher criticism, with its methods systematized"—and he assumes that "any imparted sincere effort to furnish an example of these methods in application must be welcomed if prepared with reasonable qualification for the task," and adds, p. vi., "Such is the purpose of the present volume." At page xii. he sets forth the Critic's method in operating his cult of Higher Criticism in his attack upon the Bible (italics ours), viz.:

"His (the Critic's) *method* must be, if only for the sake of his science, *to think himself*, to the utmost into the atmosphere and circumstances, yes, above all, *into the spirit ideals* and *feelings* of Jesus of Nazareth": i. e., the *method* of day-dreams speculative imagination, instead of the scientific method—that of Jural Science, which through evidence ascertains and establishes fact and verity.

The book thus heralded as a studied "example" of the higher criticism, its "methods in application," etc., seems sufficiently prominent and representative, to be subjected to the tests of Jural Science, its rigor and thoroughness in elucidating facts and verity, when in dispute. The book attacks the Bible by the hostile contention that the content of more than one-half of the 107 verses in Christ's words in chapters v., vi. and vii. of Matthew† are not, never were, a part of the Sermon on the Mount—that Matthew falsely inserted them in his record, and by necessary implication impugns the integrity of Matthew; makes him a false historian. This obviously is destructive Higher Criticism of the Bible.

Examination shows that the foundation on which the author bases his hostile contention is "*supposition.*" He supposes (and assumes the supposition as true) that the discourse recorded by Matthew in chapters v., vi. and vii. and the verses 20-49 recorded in Luke vi., are separate reports of one and the same identical discourse. Then from widely variant statements, divergencies and expression, imagined purposes and intentions of the writers, and great contrasts in representation of the two discourses, Dr. Bacon in operating his cult of higher criticism deduces the conclusion, which he claims justifies his contention, striking out more than half of Matthew's record of the Sermon on the Mount.

We deny Dr. Bacon's contention and the supposition on which it is based, and on the contrary, we aver that the discourse recorded by Matthew was a discourse delivered on a definite occasion, and that the discourse recorded by Luke was another and separate discourse, delivered on another and separate occasion.

This makes the issue or issues. They are issues of fact; they question the verity of Dr. Bacon's supposition and contention. Whether his supposition is true or not is determined by the ordeal of trial by the evidence. The evidence is that found in the Bible documents. Christ's Sermon on the Mount was an event. Every discourse delivered is an event. Every event that comes into existence in the world, comes with two inevitable, unavoidable concomitants, viz., time and place: time when, and place where, the event comes into being. We have, therefore, these criteria of time and place by which to test and try Dr. Bacon's supposition and contention. We will consider first the criterion of time.

* "The Sermon on the Mount," by Professor Benjamin W. Bacon, of Yale University. (McMillan Co., N. Y.)

† At p. 89, Professor Bacon combines for the "Sermon on the Mount" verses from Matthew as follows: Ch. v.: 7, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48. Ch. vi.: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, 17, 18. Ch. vii.: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28—thirty-seven verses—and from Luke vi.: 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 35, 46, 47, ten verses similar to verses in Matthew. Adding them to the 37 from Matthew and the score is only 47—less than half of the 107 Matthew records as the sum. Our space prevents quoting them. The reader with this list can readily see what the Critic strikes out from Matthew.

We have also in Christ's ministry another event, that in which he chose from his disciples twelve by names, ordained and named them Apostles. The discourse recorded by Matthew and that recorded by Luke are each related in time to that event in which the Apostles were chosen. We have, therefore, in that event a time datum by which we may test the verity of Dr. Bacon's contention.

The first twelve chapters of Matthew record in chronological order the steps or proceedings taken or employed by Jesus in executing his Messianic Mission, from its beginning up to and including the choosing of the twelve apostles and sending them forth. The record shows, that after commencing that mission, one step or proceeding follows in sequence a precedent step, and shows relation between them. These steps include two extended missionary tours or campaigns. The first one is called by commentators, Jesus' Circuit in Galilee. Each tour is described, not as it progressed, but clearly upon its termination. Of each tour or campaign, the fact is recorded, that the Master recognizing the needy condition of the multitude—like sheep without a shepherd—the Master takes a new step in each, consequent upon such recognition of that condition. This is set forth more fully at the termination of the Second Campaign. But, the fact is in the record here of the first tour. Consideration of the several steps will enable us to get at the fact and truth here under inquiry.

The record is that, leaving Nazareth, Jesus "Came and dwelt in Capernaum" and:—

"From that time Jesus began to preach and say, Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Jesus seeing Peter and Andrew casting their net into the sea, "Saith unto them: Follow me and I will make you fishers of men." Matt. iv. 17, 18. They left their nets and followed Jesus (and so likewise did James and John). That is, Jesus' expressed promise was that upon their complying and following him, he would instruct, train, and fit them as disciples to become teachers—ministers in what the Master was exemplifying—teaching and realizing the Christian religion in the world and bringing souls into the Kingdom. That was the distinct compact that Jesus made with disciples and the obligation he assumed on their behalf.

This compact must be kept in mind, for it is a guiding factor in understanding and applying the evidence throughout the matter we are considering. The first of the two missionary tours, its termination, results and consequences, are recorded in Matt. iv. 23-25, and v. 1, 2. "And Jesus went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of diseases among the people." One result was:—

"And his fame went throughout all Syria." All Syria was the country adjoining the east line of the Mediterranean Sea and extending to the Euphrates Valley, and from Taurus on the north to Arabia on the south. Another result of this missionary tour was,—"And they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with diverse diseases and torments, all those which were possessed with devils and those which were lunatic and those that had the palsy, and he healed them." And there followed him great multitudes of people from (1) Galilee, and from (2) Decapolis, and from (3) Jerusalem, and from (4) Judea, and from (5) beyond the Jordan. "Great multitudes (plural) from five designated regions. The consequence of these results is recorded in the very next clause of Matthew. "Jesus *seeing* the multitudes" took the next step in his mission, "went up into a mountain," etc. The greek word here translated "seeing" is ειδον, defined "To know"—to "be acquainted." It was not a matter merely of physical eyesight. But the true thought of the Master was "knowing," appreciating, realizing the real condition of the multitudes—their need as related to his Messianic mission. And in view of that Jesus took the next step. "Went up into a mountain, and when he was seated (the recognized position of a teacher) his disciples came unto him. And he opened his mouth and *taught* them" what is recorded in Matt. v., vi. and vii. This initial lesson is in strict performance of his compact with his disciples. In this teaching Christ deals

with his disciples as regenerated souls already enlisted for Christian service, viz.:

"Ye are the salt of the Earth."
"Ye are the light of the World."

Truth would have prevented the Master from addressing those statements to a promiscuous assembly, or to any except regenerated souls already devoted to Christian service. Although that great lesson was then taught, and the need of the multitude was urgent, it is apparent that the disciples were not then fitted to be called to the apostleship and its momentous responsibilities, for they were not then called or appointed.

After that great lesson Jesus and his disciples came down from the mountain, and presently, accompanied with the disciples, Jesus entered upon his second missionary tour. Between the time of teaching the initial lesson (Matt. v.-vii.) and the termination of the second campaign (Matt. ix. 35), the record (ch. viii. and ix.) shows that Jesus and his disciples traversed the country. They crossed the Sea of Galilee several times—they were in the country of Gergesenes.

The termination and description of the second campaign, its results and consequences, is recorded in Matt. ix. 35-38, and x. 1-5. It was more thorough than the first, taking in as it did *all the cities* and *the villages*. "And Jesus went about all the cities and the villages teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom," and miracles of healing were wrought.

Time required for the second campaign was considerable. Jesus and disciples moved on foot; when a place was reached a mission of some days was held—this in each city and village; thus many weeks were spent—obviously months. The record continues: "But when he saw the multitudes he was moved with compassion for them, because they were distressed and scattered as sheep having no shepherd," i. e., without fit teachers. "Then saith he unto his disciples, the harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few: Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth laborers into his harvest."

The results and consequences of the second campaign are portrayed — multitudes suffering for lack of fit teachers — recognized by the Master, and his consequent determination to take a new step, i. e., the calling and appointing twelve disciples to be apostles and sending them forth as such teachers. The praying enjoined on the disciples was for them by themselves. It appears this obligation laid on the disciples to pray, was given the day or evening before the apostles were chosen, wisely directing their thought to such event. This is seen more clearly by Luke's record. Luke vi. 12 shows that Jesus, separate from his disciples, "went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer," and "when it was day he called unto him his disciples and of them he chose twelve whom also he named apostles."

The evidence subjected to the scrutiny of Jural Science shows that the discourse recorded by Matthew v.-vii. was *taught* to Jesus' disciples before, and many weeks or months before, the twelve were called and chosen apostles.

This is so obvious that Dr. Bacon it seems saw it, and perhaps inadvertently wrote it in his book at page 65. The doctor has a scheme to get rid of the great multitudes Matthew describes (Matt. iv. 25), claiming that Matthew borrowed the description from Mark, and he says:

"In Matthew the assemblage is quite unaccountable, for here the mighty work of Jesus is as yet in the future, save for the sweeping generalization of iv. 23. Even 'his disciples,' although addressed according to v. 1, were not called until long after."

Now, turning to the time when the discourse recorded by Luke vi. 20-49 was spoken, we find (as already noted) that the night before the apostles were chosen, Jesus went out into a mountain, remaining there all night in prayer—the disciples by themselves—that at early morning Jesus called his disciples unto him, and of them chose twelve by name and designated them apostles. The disciples not chosen and the apostles were with Jesus in the mountain. After recording the names of the apostles, the record is that Jesus "came down with

them and stood in the plain." There was a multitude of people there. It was at the end of the second campaign and people had been following him. It was at or near his residence at Caperanum. Knowledge that he was there explains the gathering of multitudes whom it is recorded "came to hear him and to be healed of their diseases." After miracles of healing were wrought the record is that the discourse (Luke vi. 20-49) was delivered.

The discourse recorded by Matthew was *taught* to the disciples *before* the apostles were chosen. The discourse recorded by Luke was *spoken,* not taught, *after* the apostles were chosen. Tested by the criterion of time, the two discourses were not separate reports of one and the same identical discourse.

Trying the issue on the criterion of place by the evidence, the result is the same. The Matthean discourse was taught by the Master after he had gone up into the mountain and sat down there as teacher. After the lesson, Jesus and the people came down from the mountain. The Lukan discourse was spoken after Jesus had been out in the mountain all night, from which he "came down" and stood on the plain. The more accurate translation in R. V. is, he came down "and stood on a level place." This makes the antithesis between "out on the mountain" and "down to a level place" more distinct. The place of delivery of the Matthean discourse was one, and the place of delivery of the Lukan discourse was another and different place.

What evidence does Dr. Bacon claim to support his supposition? After many pages of discussion to overcome what he calls prejudice against higher criticism of the Bible, he states, "the occasion and circumstances and the persons addressed," i. e., by the two discourses. He then labors to make it appear that Matthew borrowed his description of multitudes from Mark and Luke likewise in order to support his supposition that the two discourses are separate reports of one discourse, by showing that multitudes identically described were present at each discourse, and he uses two or three pages on this subject and then says, "the occasion settled." We have next to consider the great contrast in representation of matters contained between Luke and Matthew. We have seen most *ample reason* for the multitude described by Matthew before that discourse, for Jesus' fame had spread through all Syria. Wherever thereafter Jesus appeared or wrought, a multitude assembled. But the doctor's effort to indentify the two discourses reported as separate reports of one discourse by showing that a multitude was present at each must be deemed as futile as it would be to undertake to identify a particular day in the desert of Sahara, by showing that the atmosphere on that day was dry, the temperature hot, and that the blazing rays of the sun smote the desert with no cloud to intervent. These are the concomitants of several hundred days in the desert of Sahara in every year.

Tested by the scrutiny of Jural Science, the evidence shows that the discourse *taught* to the disciples (Matt. v.-vii.) was one discourse delivered at a definite time and place, and the discourse recorded by Luke vi. 20-49 was another discourse, delivered at another and different time and place, and the supposition and contention of Dr. Bacon is untrue, and all his deductions dependent upon that untruth are baseless—nullities.

THE KAISER AND THE BIBLE.

I often read the Bible. I like to read it every night. A Bible lies on a table at my bedside. I find the most beautiful thoughts expressed in it. I can not understand how it is that so many persons pay so little attention to the Holy Scriptures. Can any one read the Gospels, and other portions of the Bible, without feeling convinced that the words contain a simple truths, established on unquestionable facts? Whenever I have to make a decision, I ask myself what the Bible would teach me to do in that particular case. The Bible is to me the fountain from which I draw light and strength. In hours of sorrow and depression I seek consolation therein.. —*Kaiser Wilhelm, as quoted in the Christian (London).*

Where Are We?

THE METHODIST REVIEW, NOVEMBER, 1913.

Name of Author Not Given.

"There is a great change of front in Germany and Holland. Professor Feine, of Halle, has published three very interesting articles entitled 'Positive Theological Research in Germany,' in recent numbers of the *Expository Times*. In the first of these he writes: 'In German theology at the present day a remarkable swing of the pendulum is taking place, inasmuch as on the part of positive theology in particular important works have been completed, greater undertakings are being planned, and new and promising lines of thought have been opened up. . . . The battle against the historical reconstruction of religious history of the Israelites has been successfully waged.' We can heartily recommend these articles to the reviewer of Professor Fowler's book in this Review who says on the last page of the March-April (1913) number: 'The chaos has made way for order, and at the present time scholars are pretty well agreed on practically all the important questions relating to the literary history of Israel.' If the term scholars applies only to those who repress the dates of every book of the Old Testament who teach that connected prose writing did not begin till the time of David and Solomon, that most of the Psalms were written after the exile, then he is correct. Is it, however, impossible for a man to be a *scholar* and not accept these radical views? If that be so, then a very large number of the best-known professors in the theological seminaries of America are not scholars. Away with such conceit! If one is as well versed in Hebrew and Greek, in Assyriology and Egyptology, in archæology and biblical research as the best, why should he be not considered a scholar because of his inability to subscribe to the doctrines of the 'historical school'?

"Professors Oettle, Konig, Kittel, Sellin, Robertson, Orr, and many others have demonstrated the inaccuracy of the thesis that the prophets of the eighth century were the first to establish ethical monotheism, and have done this by direct quotations from the writings of these very prophets. No one can read Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah—unless he has a theory to maintain—without being convinced that these prophets were not the founders of a new religion, but rather men called of God to reform the backsliders of their age and country. Even Stade, Volz, and Wellhausen himself have been constrained to see the force of this argument.

"So great has been the change in Germany during the past decade that book after book has been published in opposition to the Wellhausen theory which, account for it as you may, had reduced the religious element in the Hebrew Scriptures to a low level and all but denied the supernatural and the prophetic. The positive theologians put a far higher value upon the Bible as a revelation from God. They see in the 'Old Testament religion the dispensation of God's redeeming will.' Just at this very time a new commentary on the entire Old Testament, under the supervision of Professor Sellin, is passing through the press. The assigned reasons for this new series are evident: the liberal school touch sparingly upon the new facts brought out by recent discoveries in Bible lands. Then, again, the pastors and churches demand that there should be less hostility to revealed religion, a greater emphasis upon the soteriological teachings of the Old Testament. If we examine many of the so-called 'critical' commentaries, we sadly miss the religious element! for, as pointed out by Professor Feine, most of the liberal commentators 'do not, with all their scientific significance, make a sufficiently vivid and direct impression on their readers of the uniqueness of the Old Testament religion and its literature, of its superiority to all other ancient religions.' Professor Knudson, in his little booklet, *The Old Testament Problem*, emphasizes this point

and well says, 'In detailed exegesis the stress should be placed on the religious value of the passage or book under consideration.'

"What is true of the Old Testament is also true of the New Testament, for the positive theologians of the German universities have commenced the publication of a complet set of commentaries on the books of the New Testament too. This series is edited by Professor Zahn, of Erlingen. Those on Matthew, John, Romans, and Galatians are by Zahn himself; the others will be by some of the more prominent positive theologians of Germany. Then there is still a more popular series of compendiums and commentaries under the editorship of Professor Bess, entitled, Evangelische Theologische Bibliothek. This collection includes 'Introduction to the Old and New Testament, Dogmatics, Ethics, Symbolics and History of the Theology of the Nineteenth Century"—all written by conservative theologians. There are, too, many other books on various subjects by such well-known men as Kähler (lately deceased), Seeberg, Grützmacher, Feine, Walther, and others.

"The direct cause for most of these New Testament critical works was the destructive Old Testament Criticism which had reduced so much of the Hebrew Scriptures to myth and legend. It was but a natural result that the miracles of the New Testament, and especially the virgin birth and the resurrection of our Saviour, should be consigned to the same realms. This cropped out in the discussions conserning Jesus and Paul, in which the liberal theologians claimed that Paul was the real founder of Christianity as we have it. Then came the 'Jesus Myth' controversy, led by Professor Drews of Karlsruhe (not a theologian). Such books as the Gilmanesh-Epos by Jensen, made an easy starting point for Drew's theory. He maintains that the Gospels, like the books of Moses, were unhistorical and that the 'God-man' Jesus was a sheer myth and nothing more, though written up in the form of history. He had no difficulty in finding many parallels in other ancient literatures. Just as the unreasonable deductions of some Old Testament critics, notably those of Professor Cheyne, have disgusted the more sober liberal critics, so, too, the wild deductions of Drews have brought the liberal New Testament critics to a halt, for they are in a far greater dilemma than their conservative brothers. There is no doubt, as Drews emphasizes it, that the picture of Christ in the Gospels is that of the Son of God, a divine Redeemer, and not merely a good man. He disputes the thesis of the liberals, and so do we, 'that an historical portrait of Jesus which does not overstep the limits of the human may be obtained from the Gospels by means of historical criticism.' Positive theologians cannot accept this conclusion, for they see in Christ, the Son of God, a Redeemer from Sin, and not merely a human of the most perfect type. For, 'a man, though he be an ideal man, cannot redeem us.' Drews has caused a much greater confusion and concern in the liberal camp than among the conservatives. Those who deny the Deity of our Saviour have taken more notice of Drews' book than have the Trinitarians, for the simple reason that the Unitarian finds it a hopeless task to scientifically square his creed with the plain teachings of the Gospels. Drews is perfectly frank. To him 'the Christian belief in a divinely human Redeemer is nothing more than a myth,' while to Paul, Augustine, Luther, Wesley, Gladstone, and many of the greatest minds of the ages it was a solemn reality.

"As predicted in these pages some years ago, a wholesale denial of the miracles and prophecies of the Old Testament has been followed by like criticism of the New Testament. Destructive Criticism has once more reached its limits and has dashed itself against the rocks. The natural result is a saner mode of dealing with the Bible and a firmer faith in its divine origin and its power to lead men nearer to God.

"Where are we to-day? We are not tossed by every wind of doctrine, but more firmly stationed upon the Rock of Ages. The conservative position is much stronger now than it was ten years ago. History again repeats itself. As the Pietists of the seventeenth century, and Wesley and his

little band a century later, turned the swelling tide of rationalism and atheism in their day by preaching a simple, positive gospel, repentance and regeneration through the atoning blood of a divine Redeemer, so, too, in our day let there be a greater stress upon devout Bible study, conversion, implicit faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Then we, as the faithful in all ages, shall see the vagaries of the critics vanish like the morning mists before the healing rays of the Sun of Righteousness. Are not the great revivals of 1913 a prophecy of better days?

"Our little systems have their day:
They have their day and cease to be:
They are but broken lights of thee,
And thou, O Lord, art more than they."

Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Rev. William H. Bates, D.D., Washington, D. C.

Bishop E. E. Hoss, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is quoted in The Bible Champion for June, as having said in an address before the Methodist Ecumenical in Toronto: "I never have believed in the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews; but I could do that much more easily than I could follow Professor Peake into his belief that it was written by Priscilla. And when he is capable of believing that, I must be a little hesitant about following him on other points" (p. 258).

Professor Charles Foster Kent of Yale, in his *The Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament,* says: "The only fact definitely established is that Paul did not write it" (p. 70).

As between the doubt or lack of belief on the part of the Bishop and the cocksureness of the Professor, the modest Episcopal hesitancy is in marked contrast to the insistent assertiveness of the New Haven dogmatism. The humorist might as well have been serious when he said that it is better not to know so much than to know so many things that are not so.

Various Alleged Authors.

A number of authors have been alleged. Apollos of Acts xviii. 24-28 was first named by Martin Luther (1483-1546), and the great reformer has had quite a following. The versatile and eccentric Tertullian (circa 160-230) was the first to instance Barnabas (Acts xv. 35-39), and the idea was revived by Cameron, a Scotch critic of the 17th century. Clement of Rome (Phil. iv. 3), and Paul's companions, Luke (Col. iv. 14) and Silas (Acts xv. 40) have each been urged. Even the joint authorship of Aquilla and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 26) has been proposed, a proposition that the Standard Bible Dictionary pronounces "more curious than convincing." In an article in the *Homiletic Review,* March, 1913, John M. Grant of London has this sentence: "From these many coincidences and peculiarities, I suggest the name of Nicodemus as the probable author of the Epistle to the Hebrews." But it seems to be reserved for these suffragette, apotheosizing-women days to witness the spectacle staged at Toronto, of a woman irrupting *alone* into the domain of Bible authorship! Priscilla! No wonder the good Bishop balked.

Pauline Authorship.

That Paul was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was held by Irenaeus (115-190), who was a pupil of Polycarp, who was a pupil of the Apostle John; Clement of Alexandria (130-200); Origen (186-253); Dionysius (—264); Gregory Nazianzen (330-390); Eusebius (260-340), known as the "Father of Church History"; Chrysostom (347-407), "the golden-mouthed"; Jerome (345-420); Athanasius (296-373),

and many more of that early period.

The Council of Anioch (269), of Nice (325), of Laodicea (363), not to mention others, asserted the Pauline authorship.

The Alexandrian Church, the Churches of Palestine, Syria, Cappadocia, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor held the same view.

Says the Catholic Encyclopedia, VII., 182, "In the East the writing was unanimously regarded as a letter of St. Paul." Says "The Holy Bible Commentary" (Anglican), "The testimony of the Eastern Church is consistent and clear" (p. 5).

As to different opinions that sprang up in the Western Church we need not now concern ourselves, but may add concerning them the Anglican question: "Shall the positive testimony of men who, knowing St. Paul intimately, were qualified to give wit ness on such a point, be outweighed by the doubts of those who lived some hundred years later, and therefore were not so qualified? To do this would be to violate a fundamental rule of evidence" (Ibid, p. 5).

After surveying the whole field, Eastern and Western, and coming down to the present generation, the Dictionary of Religious Knowledge, edited by Lyman Abbott, says: "It is generally attributed to Paul . . . If not Paul's, it is certainly Pauline" (p. 421).

To be sure, many of the adroitly devised claims and skilfully drawn reasons for other authorship than St. Paul's, have appearance of no little plausibility, but none of them have seemed satisfactory to the writer, and he is therefore judicially compelled to dismiss them all; and consequently he relegates the bumptious assumption that "the only fact definitely established is that Paul did not write it," to the limbo of flatulent fiction.

A New (?) Consideration Offered.

There are considerations bearing upon the Pauline authorship, contained in the Scriptures themselves, that I have not seen adduced in any of the books, of which the terminus *ad quem*, if an apparently justifiable and seemingly required inference following be allowed, is a— shall I say demonstration?

From a Bible standpoint there are certain facts that may be accounted "definitely established" and not to be questioned.

1. The first fact is that Peter wrote his First Epistle to *the Hebrews*, dispersed Jews, "Sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" (i. 1).

2. The second fact is that he wrote his Second Epistle to the very same parties: "This is now, beloved, the second epistle that I write unto you" (iii. 1).

3. The third fact is that Paul wrote an epistle to the very same parties also: "Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written *unto y-o-u*, as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures unto their own destruction" (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16).

Such are the facts. Certainly, then, Paul wrote *an* epistle to the Hebrews. As certainly *the* Epistle to the Hebrews is Pauline: this is freely and unhesitatingly admitted on all hands.

What inference is legitimate, aye, required, if not this: viz., Paul's undeniable *an* epistle to the Hebrews is *the* Epistle to the Hebrews. If *an* epistle is not *the* Epistle, where is it?

Demonstrated? Saneness may well accept this conclusion.

It is worth while to note, in passing, that St. Peter classes St. Paul's writings—"all his epistles"—with the "other scriptures," i. e. with the Old Testament writings, for there was no New Testament then; thus positing for these also a divine origin and authority, since those "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. i. 21). And this would therefore guarantee Paul's statement that "All scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. iii. 16).

Archaeology's Contribution Towards the Grave of Higher Criticism.

By Rev. J. S. Ross, M.A., D.D.

Paper No. 1.

What is Biblical Criticism? The dictionary tells us it is a detailed inquiry into the origin, integrity, authority and text of the Bible. Where the inquiry relates to the text only, it is called lower criticism. Higher criticism refers exclusively to the historical and literary features of the Bible, and presupposes the correctness of the text. Conclusions built, therefore, upon a corrupt text, or an incorrect translation, must necessarily be erroneous; hence the ultimate necessity of having a correct text or translation. Herein lies the value of the labors of the learned Jewish barrister, Wiener, in his Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra,* which cut the nerve of higher criticism in this department—an answer to which has not yet been attempted.

No one should object to the reverent criticism of the Bible. If the book is found to be untrustworthy it should be rejected as an authority over the soul, and no attention paid to its precepts. But one has a right to object to a criticism which is based on mere theories and assumptions, without proof. No matter what reputation a writer may have as a scholar, no one is bound to accept his statements, simply upon his dictum, without the existence of facts to prove them; much less when facts prove the contrary.

Consequently objection is made to the so-called higher criticism because much of it is based on unproved, and therefore untenable assertions or assumptions, among which may be named the following: The story of the Flood is a legend; the first eleven chapters of Genesis are myth; Abraham is a tribal nebulosity; the battle of the Kings recorded in the 14th chapter of Genesis is a fable; Chaderlaomer, Amraphel, Sargon and Belshazzar are pure fictions; the Hittites never existed; the Babylonians of Abraham's day were barbarians, and the Egyptians of Moses' day quite illiterate. Higher critics contend that the original narratives of the Pentateuch are the literary inventions of a very late day, hundreds of years after Moses' time. The books of Joshua and Judges fare no better. Samuel and Kings have been tampered with. Chronicles, especially, is purely fictitious.

It is contended that Moses did not write the Pentateuch for the very good reason, if true, that he did not know how to write. George Adam Smith has said: "Archæology contributes the result that Moses did not know how to read or write." (Yale Lectures, Stenographic report, Zion's Herald, Boston.) It is further contended that no so-called book of Moses could have been written earlier than 600 years after he was dead, and some contend for 1,000 years after that event. Kuenen *begins* his history of the "Religion of Israel" B. C. 800—nearly 200 years after Solomon.

Welhausen admits that a small body of men and women under Moses did make their way from Egypt through the wilderness over Jordan, into Canaan, under Joshua. Stade, however, will not admit this. It is claimed no covenant was made with Abraham, no passage took place across the Red Sea, manna never fell, and the story of the 40 years' desert life is a pure invention. Moses died, of course, but he never delivered those addresses in the plains of Moab as related in Deuteronomy. According to these critics there is no firm historical ground till Solomon; others, like Kuenen, as above, contend that there is none for nearly two hundred years later still.

But questions of authorship, geography, numbers and chronologies are small matters and purely subordinate so long as it is alleged that the history itself is fabricated. The vital question, therefore, first of all, is not the method and design of inspira-

tion, the translation of a passage, the interpretation of any book, its authorship, date or literary structure (whether composite or otherwise) but does the Old Testament give a true account of the times with which they deal, or are they a tissue of legendary tales, literary inventions, dishonest manipulations of facts and deliberate wicked forgeries jumbled together. For example:—Is the Pentateuch a mere law book, written by some unknown person or persons, 1,000 years after Moses was dead, with its historical material worthless? Is Deuteronomy a forgery? Did Hilkiah, the High Priest, who pretended to find the book, really write it himself but palmed it off in the name of Moses to secure a readier acceptance? When Christ made three quotations out of this same book to meet the temptation of Satan did he know he was quoting from a forged book? And if he knew, in what position, ethically, does this fact place the Son of God? Can we trust the Pentateuchal record when it says "These are the journeys of the children of Israel . . . . . and Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys" (Num. xxx., 1, 2.) According to higher critics this book of Numbers was originally written at the time of Ezra. If so, the first record of this story was made by an unknown writer 1,000 years after the "goings out" took place, while the record itself tells us that Moses wrote them down at the time of their occurrence. Which is correct? Again, how could Moses write anything, when, according to George Adam Smith he did not know how to write at all?

The object of these papers is to show from archæological discoveries the truthfulness of those historical portions of the Old Testament, where they can be tested by contemporaneous history, in opposition to the denial of many higher critics, radical or moderate. We are here on solid ground, and not in the region of conjecture, assumption or imagination; in the realm of fact and not of fancy. A discussion of this subject is necessary; for any book known to be untrue in its historical facts must necessarily fail to command our confidence regarding its other statements or teachings.

Before entering upon the study of these discoveries a preliminary word might be said as to the immense addition made to our knowledge, in these later years, by the ability to read the inscriptions, especially the Egyptian hieroglyphics and Assyrian cuneiform letters, so called from "cuneus," a wedge. The story of the happy guess of Grotfrend (a German, 1802), as to how he made out his first letter, the letter "r," in the word Darius, in the Assyrian inscriptions, is most interesting. Years afterwards spelling books, grammars and interlineary translations were dug up. The discovery gave a great impetus to the study of these writings, which now can be read as easily and accurately as the Hebrew.

A List of the Recent Archæological Discoveries Bearing on the Truthfulness of the Bible, Chronologically Arranged.

1843. Isaiah and King Sargon.

Isaiah xx. 1 reads: "In the year that Tartan came unto Ashdod (when Sargon the king of Assyria sent him) and fought against Ashdod and took it." Who was Sargon? The only reference to him in the Bible is in the above verse, and in all other extant literature his name was totally unknown. To rationalistic critics there could be no clearer case of the unhistorical statements of the Bible. Of course no such king existed. Consequently he never sent Tartan, his alleged commander in chief, to fight against Ashdod.

But in 1843 Emil Botta, the French consul in the district, at Khorsabad, near Nineveh, discovered the palace of this long-forgotten king; in fact, he dug right down into it, where were discovered representations of the taking of this very Ashdod. Sargon was found to be one of the mightiest Assyrian kings. How unreliable the argument from silence! Here was Sargon's name lost for over twenty-five hundred years, save in this one reference by Isaiah, yet he is now one of the best-known of the kings of Assyria.

1854. Did Belshazzar Ever Exist?

For long years it was vehemently affirmed that the Bible story of Belshazzar, as related in the fifth chapter of Daniel, was untrue, and that such could be proved, (1) negatively, that no such king was known to history, and (2) positively, that the name of the last king of Babylon, at the time of its capture, is known, and his name was Nabonibus, not Belshazzar. It seemed as if a clear case against the historical truthfulness of the Bible had been made out.

But in 1854, Rawlinson discovered in the ruins of Mugheir (Ur of Chaldea) an inscription in a temple which had been repaired by Nabonidus, the father of Belshazzar, in which the very name of the latter appears. The inscription, in part, reads as follows:—"And as for me, Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, protect thou me from sinning against thy exalted Godhead, and grant thou me graciously a long life; and in the heart of Belshazzar, my first-born son, the offspring of my loins, set the fear of thine exalted godhead, so that he may commit no sin, and that he may be satisfied with the fullness of life." Again in the Chronicle of Nabonidus occurs the following broken sentence:—"In Marchesvan, by night, on the 11th, Gobryas . . . and the son of the king was killed" (Kyle's Deciding Voice of the Monuments, pp. 287, 288) which strikingly reminds one of the verse, "In that night was Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldeans slain" (Dan. v., 30.) Belshazzar was no myth. The explanation is that he reigned conjointly with his father, and at the time of the siege by Cyrus, he occupied the palace at Babylon. Again, why did not Belshazzar offer Daniel the "second" place in his kingdom instead of the "third." Because he himself, held the second, and the best he could offer Daniel was the position of "third ruler." Thus most unexpected light has been thrown on a seemingly insoluble problem, quite in corroboration of the historical accuracy of Scripture.

1869. Did Mesha, King of Moab, Revolt Against the Bondage of Israel?

Many higher critics have delighted in pouring contempt on the historical accuracy of the books of Kings and Chronicles. They declare them to be a jumble of myths, folk-lore and self-contradictions.

In 2 Kings, i., 1 it reads: "Then Moab rebelled against Israel after the death of Ahab." In chapter iii., 4, 5, we are told what kind of annual tribute had been paid by Moab, and that the name of the Moabite king was Mesha. "And Mesha, king of Moab was a sheepmaster, and rendered unto the king of Israel an hundred thousand lambs, and an hundred thousand rams with the wool. But it came to pass when Ahab was dead, that the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel." The balance of the chapter tells that three kings went up against Mesha, but when he retired upon his capital they were unable to dislodge him, and so his rebellion was successful. Is this story true? Can it be corroborated outside of the Bible?

In 1869 Dr. Klein, a German missionary, while travelling in what was once the land of Moab, discovered a stone at Dibon, a place mentioned several times in Scripture. The date of the stone is B. C. 850, since called the "Moabite Stone." Dr. Klein did not realize the importance of his discovery, but he copied a few words, and tried to secure the stone for the Berlin Museum by offering $400. Ganneau, French Consul at Jerusalem, heard of the "find," sent men to take impressions, and offered $1,875. At once the cupidity of the Pashas and Arabs was aroused. They put fire under the stone, poured cold water upon it while hot, broke the stone in pieces by this process, and distributed the fragments as charms. Most of the fragments, however, were finally recovered and put together. The stone now rests in the Louvre, France.

The inscription consists of 32 lines and opens with the sentence: "I, Mesha, am the son of Chemosh-Gad, king of Moab, the Dibonite." Another sentence reads:—"And I erected this stone to Chemish at Kirkha a (stone of) salvation for he saved me from all despoilers, and made me see my

desire upon all my enemies, even upon Omri, king of Israel." And in another sentence, speaking of Israel, he says, "And I took from it the vessels of Yahveh and offered them before Chemosh." (Sayce's Light from the Ancient Monuments, pp. 74, 75.) Note in these extracts the same name and title of the Moabite king as found in the book of Kings, and also that the name of the covenant God of Israel occurs in the inscription spelled exactly in the same way as in the Old Testament—Yahveh (Jehovah.) The stone refers to a period of 40 years' subjection, and states that deliverance was realized at a time of invasion—particulars which exactly correspond with the Scripture record. Even Winckler admits that "Mesha's statements fully accord in every point with those of the Bible," and adds they are "certainly a weighty testimony for the reliability of the biblical historical sources."

Grimsby, Canada.

POISON! BEWARE!

The insidious fashion in which certain errant religionists sow the seeds of dissension among the churches must provoke the admiration of Satan himself. The latest example of this brought to our attention is the publication of a periodical treating the International Sabbath School Lessons under the title "Bible Study Club." Accompanying the issue covering the lessons of the first three months of the year is a letter addressed to Sabbath School superintendents, in which it is stated that the periodical is offered gratis for six months, and asking for the names of a few teachers and adult scholars to whom free numbers will be sent and who may wish later to subscribe at the rate of ten cents a year. "These presentations," says the circular, "are quite unsectarian, indeed look in the opposite direction toward the harmonization of the views of Christian peoples of all denominations." The whole purpose of the treatment to which the Sabbath School lessons are subjected is obviously to rend the churches by insinuating doctrines which are utterly contradictory to orthodox beliefs. The scholarly student of the Bible will recognize this before he has read one page, but others might easily be duped by the subtle manner in which falsehood is introduced into the body of much pious comment.—*Nashville Advocate.*

Twenty-five or thirty years ago higher criticism was confined largely to a few universities and some liberal theological seminaries. Unsuspecting believers of the Holy Scriptures said that this teaching or irresponsible schoolmen would never go beyond college walls. But they were sadly mistaken. The poison of destructive Bible criticism has gone into the magazines, popular novels, high schools, lecture platforms —among all classes of thinking people. And it is bearing fruit in moral decline.—*Lutheran Observer.*

A DANGEROUS DRIFT.

No more arrogant and self-complacent figure stalks along the highways of religious thought in the twentieth century than the system that calls itself Modern Criticism. There is a breezy optimism, a youthful cocksureness, a cool and contemptuous air of holding a right of way across the entire road, that commends itself to the multitude as evidence of truth and authority. Evidences are not wanting, however, that some who belong to the modern crowd see the perilous drift of the movement. The setting aside of the Bible is a rejection of the God who reveals in the Bible his will. The growing depreciation of the divine Book, of its reliability and sufficiency and authority, is bound to widen the gulf between men and God, between human thought, feeling and will and Jesus Christ, who declared that the Scripture could not be broken. The leaders of the new theology, the new criticism, the new ethics, drew their character, their ideals, their noble spirit, their Christian life from the old theology. We shall see what manner of men and what type of church life their vaunted improvements and substitutes will produce.—*The Christian Observer.*

It is the Bible, the Bible itself, which combats and triumphs most efficaciously in the war between incredulity and belief.

THE CLUB.

THE WORK OF JAMES ORR.

G. Frederick Wright, LL.D.

The recent death of James Orr, D.D., has removed one of the ablest and most scholarly defenders of the Bible. Dr. Orr was born in Scotland in 1844, and after graduating with high honors was, from 1874 to 1891, pastor of the United Presbyterian Church at Harwick, Scotland. But, meanwhile, his scholarship had attracted such wide attention that he was called to the chair of Church History in the United Presbyterian College of Scotland. This chair he filled for ten years. During this period he published, among other volumes, "The Christian View of God" (1893), which has gone through twelve editions, and is still one of the most important apologetical books which has been published in recent times. Dr. Orr took much interest in the union of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland with the Free Church, and after its consummation was appointed to the chair of Apologetics and Theology in the college of the united churches in Glasgow, a position which he retained until the time of his death last autumn. During this period volume after volume appeared, almost every year. Of these, probably the most important was "The Problem of the Old Testament," which secured the "Bross Prize" of $6,000.00, in 1905. The committee which awarded the prize that year were Professor George T. Ladd, of Yale University, Professor Alexander T. Ormond, of Princeton University, and Professor G. Frederick Wright, of Oberlin. From the seventy-five manuscripts submitted, they unanimously chose this. The publication of this book marked an era in the defense of the Old Testament, and remains one of the most valuable answers to the destructive critics of the Pentateuch. There followed in rapid succession, among others, "The Bible Under Trial" (1907), "The Virgin Birth of Christ" (1907), "The Resurrection of Jesus" (1908), and "Revelation and Inspiration" (1910). For the last few years before his death he was devoted to what he regarded as his most important work, the editing of a three-volume Dictionary of the Bible, which should properly represent the conservative scholarship of Christendom. The publication of this great work was undertaken by The Howard-Severance Co. of Chicago. Fortunately, Dr. Orr was spared to complete his own work on this monumental enterprise, and the dictionary will be issued in the course of the present year. This will be a boon, especially to ministers and Bible students who do not have access to large libraries, for the Bible dictionaries of recent date almost universally contain much that is very misleading regarding the historical character of both the Old Testament and the New. The publishing company, in selecting Dr. Orr for editor of this great work, chose the scholar above all others whose name will win the confidence of the Christian public.

THE FRESHET OF RATIONALISTIC JARGON.

"Had the destructive critics announced their heterodoxies as speculations, or as tentative endeavors to solve newly discovered difficulties in biblical literature, Christian scholars had patiently considered their theories; but they came forth with trumpets and banners, proclaiming the overthrow of all so-called traditionalism in religion, and substituted rank heresy for true faith. The theory that might have won attention as a theory was openly declared to be a conclusion from which there was no appeal, and any attempt to controvert the conclusion was interpreted as a proof of small scholarship and petty literary trifling on the part of those who retained respect for the teachings of the ages. To this conceited and repugnant position the Church has opposed its mature scholarship; compelling the critics to furnish the proofs of their vagaries, and demanding that truth shall have its rightful chance in the conflict with error. It cannot be said that the destructionists are furnishing the proofs, for in their ex-

---

* "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?" 1 John ii. 22. "Her prophets are light and treacherous persons; her priests have polluted the sanctuary, they have done violence to the law." Zeph. iii. 4

tremity they have resorted to sophistical speculation, imaginative and metaphysical declamation, and the usual strategies common to men who undertake to sustain a bad cause. We do not disparage the erudition of some critics; but the claim that the 'advanced' thinkers husband the learning of the times excites the ridicule and contempt of the masses of Christian scholars in this country. *There is not one scholar in ten in America who has departed from the standard faith respecting the biblical questions now in dispute between rationalists and orthodoxists.* The reader will be assisted in his appreciation of the truth of this statement if he will undertake to ascertain how many American scholars hold that Deuteronomy was written in the seventh century, B. C., and by Hilkiah, with the help of Jeremiah. He may also satisfy himself on this point if he will poll the scholars on any other problem in issue, such as infallibility, inspiration, the authorship of Isaiah, and so forth.

"It is confessed that certain American critics accept the extreme conclusions of the German rationalists, and support the conclusions by a method of argument that identifies them with the rationalists of Europe. It is not creditable to the scholarship of such critics that to this day they have not advanced one theory against traditionalism, or one argument against the orthodox position that was not drawn from the rationalists across the water. Scholarship! *Not an original theory in biblical criticism has been propounded by an American critic;* every conclusion is borrowed, and every argument is kidnapped from foreign lands. Many of the editorials, pamphlets, and books written by them are purloined, and some of them according to *secret contract,* from the literature of the other hemisphere; and yet they prate of learning, acumen, and insight and foresight as to the outcome of the Bible! Even the little phrase used by a home critic, 'snorting against higher criticism,' was borrowed from Eichorn. Satellites, not planets, they are! Is it not time to understand where the freshet of rationalistic jargon took its rise? Discovering the genesis of American rationalism, and seeing that the work and results of the home and foreign critics are identical, we pronounced the critics rationalists, and stereotyped them as Christian rationalists, because they professed to be Christians. We have met no scholar who has disputed the correctness of this application of the word, and the attempt to deride its use in this connection implies a desire to escape from what it signifies."—*Rev. J. W. Mendenhall, LL.D., Editor, Methodist Review,* May, 1890.

JEKYL AND HYDE S. S. LESSONS.

A reader of The Champion has submitted to us a sample of a Sunday School Lesson series published by the Practical Publishing Co. It bears the title, "The Practical Four-Year Lesson Course." It was formerly published as the Cross and Hurlbut Lessons. The title page formerly had upon it the name of Rev. Sidney Cross. The copy for the first year, sent us, is anonymous throughout, save at the bottom of two pages it is stated "Copyright by Stephen A. Hurlbut."

The second page of the cover is headed, "How To Use The Teacher's Outline." The last paragraph on the page contains in bold, black type this warning: "Do not leave Outlines lying around loosely at home, or in the Sunday School room. Children ought never to be permitted to read them." After we had gone through the Outlines, this warning was seen to be like the sign of a skull and cross-bones on a vial in the medicine closet. The lesson on "The Creation of the World," the first in the course, plainly furnished the reason for the warning. After giving the order of Creation in Gen. i., it was stated "The arrangement is unscientific in several respects." The next paragraph states:

"Coming now to Genesis ii., verse 4 (second half), there begins an entirely separate account of the Creation, written long before the account in chap. i. This account sets forth that the principal object in Creation is man. Tell the scholars the story of the Garden of Eden as given in the Bible. If any child demands to know whether the story is true, say that there is truth in it. Teachers are earnestly counselled to remember that although in the light of mod-

ern scholarship, the Bible has to be taught differently nowadays than in bygone times, yet no teacher has a right to assert bluntly that this or that story in the Bible is not true. Children live in a world of imagination, and the Bible stories, told in simple, straightforward fashion, are their heritage which should not be taken from them."

Mr. Hyde now peeps out between the lines and we begin to understand the warning with which the Outlines begin.

The lesson entitled "Noah's Ark" reveals the double character of the Lessons. The school is divided into two classes, senior and junior; the former are to have the interpretation of the Bible invented by the Counterfeit Critics; the latter are to have the "stories told in simple, straightforward fashion." In dealing with the Deluge it is said:

"In senior classes, teachers may touch lightly upon some of the obvious difficulties in the narrative. In these days of criticism, children do not grow very old before enquiring whether the story of Noah's Ark is literally true. The most that can be said is what was said of the story of the Garden of Eden, namely, that there is truth in it . . . The attention of seniors may be directed to the interweaving of two separate narratives, which is characteristic of the whole of the first six books of the Bible. One narrative gives one version, whilst the other narrative gives another, and sometimes a contradictory version. The writer who put the two stories together made no attempt to make them agree. Hence serious discrepancies are to be found . . . . In junior classes keep strictly to the story."

In the story on "Jacob and Esau," after relating the story of the dream, known as "Jacob's Ladder," it is said: "Jacob was absent twenty years. On his return journey he had another dream, of the 'Wrestling Angel.' He clung to the angel, and persevered in asking for a blessing, which was given him in the form of a change of character. His name also was changed from Jacob, 'Supplanter,' to Israel, 'Perseverer with God.'"

In the lesson on the "Birth of Saint John the Baptist," the seniors are taught that the scriptural expression "Angel of the Lord" is thought to mean simply God Himself appearing in human form. Let juniors think of angels with wings. Angel means messenger—hence the wings.

In the lesson on "Joseph, a Ruler in Egypt," it is said: "A number of extracts from Genesis are given as the substance of to-day's lesson. These are for the guidance of the teacher, who must dig out the story from a mass of reiteration and elaboration."

In the lesson on "How the Bible was Made," Mr. Hyde does not merely peep out, he boldly stalks out, but he tells only the seniors the following:

"Though there are 39 separate titles in the Old Testament there are not exactly 39 separate volumes, written by as many authors. For example, from Genesis to Joshua is actually one story, called the Hexateuch, printed in six parts, with each bearing a different title, which makes it look like six stories instead of one. In the same way, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah form but one volume, though separated into four parts. On the other hand, there are many cases where distinct works by different authors are collected into a single book under a single title. In these cases we are apt to think that we are reading one complete story written by one man, as, for instance, when we read the Book of Isaiah; whereas actually we are reading a number of entirely distinct stories all jumbled together and made into one volume. Nevertheless, for convenience sake, it is well for children to know that the Old Testament is commonly divided into 39 parts, and the New Testament into 27, making 66 in all."

In the lesson on "The Triumphal Entry" it is said: "S. Mat. seems to represent Jesus as riding on *two* asses. This is an apparent attempt on the part of the writer of the Gospel to make the facts harmonize with the prophecy in xxi. 5. The proper rendering of that verse, however, is: 'sitting on an ass, even a colt, the foal of she-asses.'"

In the lesson on "The Resurrection" the story is told in simplicity and upon its face without an evil purpose. The attention of the scholars is called to the difference in

the accounts. It is likened to a human story of incidents told by different persons; some would write of certain events, but forget to tell of others. This is exactly what took place when the four Evangelists wrote their Gospels. For example, what do they record of the events on Easter day? Each one tells the story differently. These differences are related in detail. The story is treated as a mere human tale. The Divine part in the relation is utterly ignored.

This course of lessons is prepared for the Sunday Schools of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It appears to be a part of the conspiracy apparent in several of the evangelical denominations, to deceive and lead astray teachers and scholars. While claiming to be evangelical in spirit and purpose, the claims of the Counterfeit Critics are assumed to be fully established and universally accepted as true. It is unnecessary to take up the individual instances. It is an attempt to be clever and specious and accomplish by indirection what it would be unsafe to teach directly. The readers of The Champion know how utterly false is the whole system. A mass of inventions from beginning to end, announced as the result of investigation, study and research, it is a jumble of guesses, theories and fables without either argument or evidence in its support.

A junior scholar who is "told the stories in simple, straightforward fashion," learns upon entering the senior classes that he has been deceived. In plain language, "the straightforward story" is a lie. If later, upon being better instructed, he learns that the Bible stories are true and the senior instruction is a lie, he is only sure of one thing, that the teacher has lied. Can anything be imagined more reprehensible? When all this is pretended to be in the service of God and for the spiritual training of innocent and trustful children, it is impossible to find language capable of characterizing it as it deserves. When Sunday School superintendents or teachers have become aware of the wicked deception, and continue to use the lessons, they are as guilty as if they were the original offenders. It ought not to take a Christian Church of high character and profound culture long to cast out lessons whose anonymous publication rightly classes them with anonymous letters.

The only thing possible is to rebuke the deceivers as they deserve, and deal with pastors, superintendents and teachers who are accomplices in the treachery as unworthy of confidence and unfit for their places of trust. The Christian denominations are facing a peril fraught with infinite disaster. Unless these insidious efforts are met boldly and determinedly the rising generation will be taught disrespect and irreverence for the Word of God and totally lose all regard for its authority.—Editor.

"It has occurred with some frequency in the last half-century," says *The Presbyterian*, of Philadelphia, "that valuable church and educational foundations have been seized and appropriated to the maintenance of doctrine and practices which are contrary to the design of the founders. When, in the name of honesty and loyalty, some rise up and refuse to allow such misappropriation, they are immediately branded as fanatical controversialists. In a word, these propagators of false and self-invented teachings must be allowed to teach what and where they will, in a most quiet and dignified way, and no one may controvert or deny what they say! They must be allowed to appropriate any and all things within their reach for their propagation, and no one may resist! This is nonsense. The evangelical church has been playing at this kind of peace too long, and it is nothing but supineness. We are glad and thankful to say that all this is past; there is an awakening, and if these revampers of the old errors think they are going to get away with everything, they are mistaken. This is like the unclean spirit's cry — Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth, art thou come to destroy us?"

"Let this precious volume have its proper influence on the hearts of men, and our liberties are safe, our country blessed, and the world happy."—*Chief Justice Hornblower of New Jersey.*

THE COUNCIL.

PRESIDENT HALL'S APPEAL.

We repeat the Appeal of President Hall in the June number. We send 1,500 copies of each number as sample copies. We desire all who receive the sample copies to read this Appeal.

The Bible League has rallied from the misfortunes caused by the long illness and breakdown of the former Secretary and Editor, Dr. Gregory. The movement to organize the friends of the Bible throughout the land can now be resumed with vigor and zeal. We purpose to take the five great Protestant denominations in turn and suggest plans to bring together in a compact army, the ministers and laymen who see great peril to the cause of God in the assaults of false scholarship upon the authority of the Word of God.

The appeal of the four bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church to the Methodist ministry, loses none of its force by the decease of three of the four. It was issued April 29, 1907. We published it in our May number, and repeat it in this number. It is printed in circular form and will be given the widest possible distribution. It is so strong in its presentation of the issues involved that it would be difficult if not impossible to surpass it. It is just as applicable to all ministers as to the Methodist.

As The Bible League is interdenominational, we propose to create a Council in each of the following cities, in which we already have a nucleus: Boston, Providence, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis and St. Paul, St. Louis, Kansas City, Des Moines, Louisville, Los Angeles. The Council will be composed of the subscribers and patrons in the cities named and their near neighborhood. A simple organization for local purposes will thus bring into touch with each other all who will actively engage in the aggressive work of the league. The Champion will serve as a medium of communication between the General Office and the various Councils. It will also be made the chief campaign agent of the league. In each city the local Council, by securing names and addresses of leading ministers and influential laymen, can have sample copies go to each. This will create public sentiment, arouse personal interest and win financial support.

We solicit the cooperation of friends of generous means to make this campaign possible and effective. If The Champion could reach a circulation of 100,000, the advertising would become a valuable aid in the maintenance of our work. One hundred persons who could each contribute $100 or more, to this campaign fund would enable us to start an immediate campaign in the cities named above.

The General Secretary will confer with our friends in these cities and where it is desirable and practicable will meet them in person and arrange for the opening of the work. This number of The Champion will be sent to many who have been reported to us as in sympathy with the purposes of the league, and may be induced to aid in such manner as their means and other obligations will permit. Communications addressed to the General Secretary soliciting information or offering cooperation will receive prompt attention. May we not urge the pledge of help by a large number who will contribute at once?

Wm. Phillips Hall,
President of the Bible League.

THE CHAMPION—INTERNATIONAL AND INTERDENOMINATIONAL.

All Evangelical denominations, from the beginning have been associated in the maintenance of the work of the Bible League. We are planning to enlarge our directorship to include repreresentatives of all the prominent denominations. We shall make special appeals to each in course through their leading ministers and laymen. Such appeals have already been made to the Methodist Episcopal, and the Methodist Episcopal, South. In this number we publish a very striking article by Rev. W. B. Riley, D.D., pastor of the First Baptist Church, Minneapolis. He is one, of the

most influential and able leaders of the denomination. His church is one of the largest in the connection. A letter will be sent to one thousand prominent ministers and laymen of the Baptist Church with a sample copy of the August number of THE CHAMPION.

The list of countries to which THE CHAMPION is sent, warrants our claim to be International. They are as follows:

Argentine Republic, Asiatic Turkey, Australia, Austria, Bermuda, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cape Colony, Chile, Corea, Cuba, Egypt, England, European Turkey, Formosa, Germany, Hawaii, Holland, India, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Persia, Philippines, Porto Rico, Scotland, Siam, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, Syria, Tasmania.

In this country and Canada we reach 1592 towns and cities in 46 states and provinces. In every one of these communities we desire to begin at once an aggressive campaign. Where we have but a single reader, we desire to secure a Gideon's Band of ten or more; in every city, a legion of one hundred or more; in every leading city, a great host. We solicit the most earnest co-operation and support of every subscriber. A postal card pledging sympathy and help will cheer and encourage us just now.—EDITOR.

CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR FRIENDS.

We copy from the June CHAMPION a part of our Congratulations brought up to date.

When I was elected secretary of the Bible League, we had nothing with which to start but the mailing list. It contained several thousand names, all, from one year to five years behind in their subscriptions. There was no way to revise or correct the list but to appeal to the subscribers. You can understand our problem, when you recall that the magazine had been discontinued as a monthly, April, 1911; the next number issued was September, 1911; the next number, February, 1912; then bi-monthly until October, 1912; the next and last number, April, 1913. The subscribers who had been on the list the last two years had paid for twenty-four numbers of the magazine and had received but seven. I took charge July, 1, 1913 and issued the first number of THE BIBLE CHAMPION, August 1913. We have issued monthly, since, 5,000 copies.

We have sent the magazine to every name on the list, following with a personal letter to all subscribers. We offered to make good the seventeen numbers which had not been issued because of the illness of the former Editor. We named an amount, based upon the record of the mailing list, which would pay subscriptions until January, 1915, making allowance for the missing numbers. We found many errors, and apologized, but pushed ahead. The result is so marvelous in our eyes that we give God all the glory. It is evident he does not desire the Bible League to go out of business.

The report for the year will not be complete until July 31. As we go to press early in the month, so the August number will reach our readers by the first of the month, we will give in the September number the complete report. We have received for renewals, $1,745.95; new subscriptions, $515.04; donations, $3,907.74; total, $6,168.-73.

Returns from 2,500 letters to leading ministers and laymen have not yet been received. They will be added to the complete report in the September number. Every week brings in renewals from the subscribers who are back in their date and have as yet made no payment. There are several hundred, and we have reason to believe nearly if not quite all will remain with us and make their payment. We believe we will be able to begin the new year with a paid up list of 2,500.—EDITOR.

THE CONTINENT-WIDE CAMPAIGN.

We rejoice to announce that THE CHAMPION is restored to leadership in the campaign for the defense of the Word of God. We propose to make it continent-wide at once. We solicit the co-operation of all Evangelical Christianity. THE CHAMPION has shown that the attack upon the Scriptuers is pitiless and conscienceless. It

would seem like the frenzy of a madman's dream, were it not commercialized. Authors and publishers have seized upon it for profit. Great men have made it the instrument of their ambition and by it hope to become dominant leaders. Little men have found that by it they can escape obscurity and win notoriety. With no hope of distinction by legitimate effort, they are satisfied with the temporary sensation they create. There are good and honorable men who have been led astray, and possibly like Paul may believe they do God service by dishonoring His Word and destroying His Church, but they are a small per cent. of the enemy.

The true spirit and purpose of the campaign is apparent to all who will carefully read. Nothing new is taught. The refuted arguments, the discredited fallacies, the disgraceful inventions of ancient infidelity, are revived and exploited as brand new products of the Modern Mind. Christian clergymen and college professors have not scrupled to recall Hume and other enemies of God and offer them as teachers of sacred truth. Voltaire, Paine and Ingersoll were prophets born out of due time. Had they lived to-day they might have enjoyed the perquisites and distinction of an editor of a great Christian periodical, a professorship or the presidency of a great Christian college, or a pastorate of a great Christian church. Nothing that either ever uttered or wrote against the Bible surpassed in perversion of truth or wickedness of purpose that which is taught to-day by professed Christian teachers and leaders. As if it were not enough to seek to win to their views, men of experience and education, who might weigh, consider and decide, traps are set for innocent children and ignorant and unwary youth. Nothing is more appalling than the eagerness to introduce into Sunday Schools, Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations and colleges these dangerous and deceptive errors.

Unless the Christian Church arouses herself to meet this attack upon the foundation stone of religion, with stern and energetic effort, there is to come at no distant day an apostasy that will be more disastrous than that of the dark ages. Cunning, treachery and deception must be revealed, denounced and defeated by concerted, untiring and unremitting effort by all Christians of all creeds. THE CHAMPION has a nucleus in each of the important cities named by President Hall in his Appeal. We suggest that they get together. One hundred men of character, ability and standing can dominate and direct the religious thought and life of any city. It needs to be remembered that the rank and file of average Christians are with us universally.

The General Secretary of the Bible League is planning to visit personally these cities to confer with the friends of the Bible and aid in organizing Councils for the direction of the campaign. A letter will be sent soon, to all our readers in these cities suggesting a work of preparation and soliciting the co-operation and help of each one. A brief reply of suggestion and pledge of helpfulness and sympathy will be gratefully appreciated. Names of men and women of means who will aid in publishing and distributing THE CHAMPION are solicited. One hundred who will each give $100 would enable us to issue many thousands of our magazine as sample copies which would win friends in every part of the land. When we circulate 100,000 monthly, as we hope to do before long, we can plan for a campaign that cannot fail. Will not each reader get five friends to subscribe?—EDITOR.

Any system claiming to be related to Christianity that denies the miraculous or the supernatural is a libel on what Christ teaches. He has all power on earth and in heaven; he is God as well as man. He has charge of the forces of nature, and directs all currents of power. Unitarianism is the infidelity of the days long gone. It masquerades in the garb and name of Christianity; but in reality it has nothing fundamentally in common with the Christianity of Christ.—*Texas Christian Advocate.*

The reason why we find so many dark places in the Bible is, for the most part, because there are so many dark places in our hearts.

CURRENT COMMENT.

AN APPRECIATION OF DR. AKED.

The recent utterances of Dr. Charles F. Aked, pastor of a wealthy Congregational church in San Francisco, has brought the subject of Biblical criticism to a more intense and conspicuous stage than had been reached in recent months or years.

Dr. Aked declared his disbelief that Jesus was born of a virgin, and subsequently gave out communications and interviews intended to sustain his assertion that were even more radical and offensive than his pulpit declamation. Presbyterian members of the Ministerial Association of San Francisco requested Dr. Aked's resignation as president because of his profane assertions, but the association as a whole declined to accept the preacher's resignation when tendered. While such "liberal" journals as *The Continent, The Congregationalist* and *The Christian Register* (Unitarian) have approved the action of the Ministerial Association, the evangelical religious press has almost universally condemned it. In THE BIBLE CHAMPION, several pages of extracts from the press are quoted. (We may add that the comment of *The Presbyterian of the South* is given the place of honor in the entire list—the only black cap headline.)

But we were remarking that the discussion has grown impressively pungent and searching, a large specimen of which is found in THE CHAMPION, with which we cordially sympathize. We are tempted to covet the power of lucid, incisive and overwhelming statement possessed by the talented and scholarly editor.

As the *Herald and Presbyter* reminds us, it matters not how harsh and bitter and rotten an opponent of the faith may be, clinging the while to a church whose principles he repudiates, but whose cash he likes, those who object to his continuance as an accredited minister of the church he scorns will be branded as "heresy hunters." Our exchange goes on to say: "We are reminded of the boy who protested against his little brother's noise, and when asked what the child had done, he said, 'every time I hit him on the head he hollers.' We believe in comity, but not with those who strike us, and when we object, strike us again and call us names."—*The Presbyterian of the South.*

"NEW CHRISTIANITY," AS DEFINED BY CHICAGO UNIVERSITY LEADERS.

Members of the University of Chicago Divinity School faculty have defined the characteristics of a "new Christianity" in an official editorial in the Biblical World, responsibility for which is accepted by the thirteen editors. They point to the "new Christianity" as a type of faith which shall result in "the releasing of men's minds from the bonds of tradition and creed." It is described as "scientific, ethical, practical and altruistic."

"If there be a controversy between Genesis and geology, the new Christianity will stand with geology," the editorial says. "The record left in the strata of the earth cannot be impugned by a poet of the prescientific age, even though that poet be also a prophet of a higher conception of God than had before his day prevailed. In conformity to the same principle the new Christianity will accept the assured results of historical investigation into the records of ancient times. Religion has its rights, but so also has history, and one of these is that it is studied by historical methods."

Justice Caton declared:

"Church property is rarely paid for by those alone who there worship, and those who contribute to its purchase or erection are presumed to do so with reference to a particular form of worship, or to promote the promulgation or teachings of particular doctrines or tenets of religion, which in their estimation, tend most to the salvation of souls; and to pervert the property to another purpose is an injustice of the same character as the application of other trust property to purposes other than those designed by the donor. Hence it is that those who adhere to the original tenets and doctrines, for the promulgation of which a church has been erected, are the sole bene-

ficiaries designed by the donors, and those who depart from and abandon these tenets and doctrines cease to be beneficiaries, and forfeit all claim to the title and use of such property."

THE DEFENSE OF GOD'S WORD.

Do you take THE BIBLE CHAMPION, organ of "The Bible League of North America?" Some splendid articles have been going through it lately. One by Simon Greenleaf, LL.D., entitled "An Examination of the Testimony of the Evangelists," another by Professor L. T. Townsend, LL. D., on "Is there a Place of Punishment Called Hell?" It is inimitable! These two articles are worth the $1 per year subscription to the magazine, which is published at 317 East 118th Street, New York City, N. Y. Then there is another series of papers on "Jonah and the Whale," that make most interesting reading. Does your minister take this periodical? If not, and if you have a dollar to spare in your tithing account, would it not please him very much if you expended it this way?—*The Canadian White Ribbon Tidings.*

THE INFALLIBLE BOOK.

Any reasonable and consistent and thorough view of inspiration drives us to the position that the original writings must have been free from error. If the authors of the books of the Bible were simply unique spiritual teachers, with a natural gift for seeing and stating religious truth, it is conceivable that they may have exercised this gift in connection with the frailties of the human mind.

If, on the other hand, they were God's spokesmen, the intelligent organs of Divine Revelation to man, were inspired or guided by God in such a way as to utter his Word, then their utterances are authoritative and constitute a divine law, an infallible rule of faith and practice. And it is not fairly credible, it will not commonly be accepted by men at large, that God, who filled their minds and their mouths, permitted them to make misleading and ignorant assertions on matters contained in their message and put forward by them as a part of their communication from God. Their reliability would inevitably be made a part of their credentials. At that point they would be rigorously tested. And the God who sent them and spoke through them would not see them with their message discredited and its value discounted at the outset. The common sense of mankind will never accept a fallible teacher as a divine guide, a fallible book as an authoritative revelation of the divine will.—*Christian Observer.*

A MATTER OF HONESTY.

Above all dishonest men of whom I know anything is the one who will accept the salary from a church or theological seminary, raised by the self-sacrifice of evangelical people, and then teach or preach heresy. One may steal my gold, but there is more; he may steal my food and drink, but there is more; but the man who will rob others of their religious faith is contemptible and wicked at the same time. It is worse than robbing a hen roost. Men of this sort are sending more souls to hell than any other class. Men out on the frontier, and in the push and front of the small missionary fields have no desire to deny the virgin birth of Christ, or the inspiration of the Scriptures. One who disbelieves the evangelical truth and becomes a Unitarian will not stay in a position where he lives on money given by evangelical people to spread the truth of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

D. B. MCLAUGHLIN.

Everett, Wash.

—*The Herald and Presbyter.*

A DANGER SIGNAL.

Never has the Bible received as much attention in the higher schools of learning in this country, and never was the method of study as full of danger to the faith of the men and women of to-morrow. Only in comparatively few cases is it taught and reverenced as the Word of God. Our Bible may be allowed to "contain the Word of God," but nothing more. Indeed, it is questionable if it would not be better for the faith and morals of the people if the Bible was cut out of the curriculum altogether.

Some Covenanter young people have gone, at one time or another, to the Bible

Training School at Springfield, Massachusetts. This school is specially for Y. M. C. A. workers, and, therefore, its students have seldom the training to enable them to discriminate between the truth and falsehood of the information given to them. On account of a published address of the president of the school, a reader of the *Christian Nation* wrote to him, and the following quotation is part of the letter received in reply:

"Take the Psalms. Read in any text, they show moral defects, they show un-Christian sentiments. My students believe and love all the good things in the Psalms, and yours can do no more. But your students think that the bad things have some good explanation. What advantage is that to them? What I am interested in is the statements that are in the Bible, whoever put them there. The person who believed and said that God hardened Pharaoh's heart so that he could show off his power on him, and that God then brought plagues and death upon the poor common Egyptians because of Pharaoh's hardness, that person says what I do not believe, and I do not care whether it was Moses himself, or the author of the document, who wrote it."

This will give one an idea what the young men are getting who are being trained for Y. M. C. A. work in Springfield, Mass. Whatever doubts President Ballentine has about Moses and David, he expresses no lack of confidence in his own ability to re-write the Bible.—*The Christian Nation.*

DENYING THE RESURRECTION.

In this age of skepticism and doubt, we read and hear much of the new theology and its teachers. Some of those men, even denying the resurrection of our Saviour, are yet teachers of our young men, preparing them for the ministry. Take this great truth of Christ's resurrection from the Bible and there would be nothing left to comfort the Christian's heart. "If Christ is not risen, our faith is vain, and we are yet in our sins" (1 Cor. i. 17). Why not, then, educate these young men for some other business in life, instead of wasting their valuable time over such an unreliable book as the Bible? Christianity would be a myth, and salvation, that is spoken of from Genesis to Revelation, but a Jewish superstition. The men that teach in this way are spiritually blind, and have never felt the power of God's salvation in the heart, that thrills the soul with supreme love to him, removing all doubt as to his power on earth to forgive sin.—*Ex.*

AN EMBARRASSING CHANGE OF BASE.

The effort of the present day to restore the Bible to our public schools is bringing out the hatred of its enemies, and they are using the press to fight the movement. The latest argument in a Columbus daily is that "These preachers do not believe their own Bible, as of any authority, or worth." To prove it they are quoting some of these higher critics, and naming them out at that. It is embarrassing for some men to stand up and defend the Word after they themselves have indorsed the views of Paine, Hume, Voltaire and Ingersoll. Then think of their names being now associated by these skeptics with noted infidels, and their very learned (?) arguments to save the Book from its fancied unreasonableness and thereby saving the world from its unbelief. How ungrateful in these infidels to misunderstand and misrepresent the thinking talent of men who dared to take an enlightened stand against superstitious orthodoxy!

Destructive criticism is a boomerang that will kill the fellow that throws it.—*Christian Standard.*

Approaching his Bible with a student's equipment the Christian should bring also a student's attitude. He desires to learn to progress, in the way of life and not to test or prove out certain pre-conceived theories of his own, or indeed those of others as humanly fallible as himself. The Bible is God's revelation of himslf to man, and through its pages each must, in the last analysis, trace for himself the divine lessons. An open mind, an honest will and a reverent heart, these three lead to sovereign power in Bible study.—*George J. Anderson.*

EDITOR'S WHAT NOT.

THEOLOGICAL FASHIONS.

There are fashions in theology as in dress. They are often as grotesque and freakish in one as in the other. There is the voluminous crinoline creed which includes nothing in the Bible but everything outside of it. There is the scant silk skirt cult in which the believer believes only that which he knows. The Bible fashion in theology is simple, clear, and requires few words to describe it. Do what the Scriptures enjoin; abstain from that which they forbid. Among those who repudiate the authority of the Bible, there is no standard. Each devotee is his own arbiter. A quotation from Proverbs adapted by individual interpretation suggests how they develop their creed. "As the scholar thinketh in his heart so *is* IT." The ultimate authority is "the inner consciousness." The revelation of the Holy Spirit is displaced by the self-inspiration of the sub-conscious spirit. There are as many creeds as there are persons and each faith is just as good as any other." The favorite remark is, "I do not get my religion from a book—but from my own personal experience."

The Christian who foolishly steps off the solid rock of a faith founded upon the Word of God into the quagmire of speculation and theory finds little assurance in a hypothesis and less comfort in a hallucination. Fashions in theology, like those in dress, are largely imported. America for a few years has had a freak fashion in theology which was all the rage in a number of exclusive circles. It was much like the colored man's conscience which he declared was "something inside of him that said I won't." Its only argument was "Taint so." One can well imagine the distress and despair of these devotees when they learn that the foreign fashion is discarded where it was first invented. The quotation from the *Methodist Review*, page 21, will cause serious alarm and deep regret when its truth fully dawns upon the sub-conscious mind of the devotees of the cult. "Where shall we go in the time of the Deluge, our ark is scuttled?" If they will ask the Jubilee Singers of Fisk University to sing "The Old Ship of Zion," they will learn,

> She has landed many a thousand,
> And will land as many a more.
> She is loaded down with angels,
> And King Jesus is the Captain,
> And He'll carry us all home,
> Glory Hallelujah!

THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS.

When the father of tragedy wrote, "God is not averse to deceit in a holy cause," he gave his god his character. The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table was not far astray when he said: "Sin has many tools, but a lie is the handle which fits them all." It is difficult to draw any moral distinction between the offenses branded in the Ten Commandments. It may be doubted if any one is productive of more evil than *lying*.

John catalogues it with other gross vices and declares: "Liars and every one that doeth a lie, shall have a part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." (Rev. xxi. 8; xxii. 15.) It would seem like carrying coals to Newcastle to warn scholars to be on their guard against this vice when discussing and commenting on the Holy Scriptures. Yet men have been known to "stamp God's name upon a lie just made, to turn a penny in the way of trade." It would not be a violation of the commandment to state that if the counterfeit critics would obey it, they would largely decrease their output. We will not particularize here, but request our readers carefully to read the article, "Where Are We?" copied from the *Methodist Review*, found in the June number and in this number.

We suggest a very simple test which anyone can apply. Treat the testimony of the writer as if it were given under oath in court, subject to cross examination, the plea of the opposing attorney and the decision of the judge. In presuming to criticize the Word of God, why is it necessary to violate every principle of fairness, honesty and truthfulness? Men who claim to be fair-minded and truthful, deliberately

falsify the statements they discuss by omitting a vital part, or interpolating a theory of their own invention.

We need only quote a few sentences from the article in this number, page . "Scholars are pretty well agreed on practically all the important questions relating to the literary history of Israel." "The prophets of the eighth century were the first to establish ethical monotheism." "The liberal school touch sparingly upon the facts brought out by discoveries in Bible lands." "In many of the so-called critical commentaries we sadly miss the religious elements." "So much of the Hebrew Scriptures is reduced to myth and legend." "Paul was the real founder of Christianity as we have it, and not Jesus." "The Gospels like the books of Moses were unhistorical." "The God-man Jesus was a sheer myth and nothing more."

This is sufficient for our purpose. This is not criticism. This is plain, deliberate, intentional lying. The author with but few words shows how far from the truth all this is. Christian scholars make a mistake in dignifying lying with discussion. It only needs declaration and denunciation and penalty. If it were in court, the false witness would escape punishment for perjury only on the score of ignorance or feeble-mindedness.

EVE AND THE SERPENT.

It is a wise rule of Bible interpretation not to force a literal sense where it does not belong, though a literal sense if possible should be preferred to that which is figurative.

The question, for instance, in the record of the temptation of Eve is whether it was Satan in the form of a snake that appeared to Eve and conversed with her, or whether he appeared in some more attractive form, or whether the entire account is figurative. The last supposition is set aside in recognition of another rule of interpretation, that when one is in doubt whether the literal, or figurative meaning is intended, the literal should have the preference.

That a woman even in the Garden of Eden held conversation with a literal snake and paid great deference to it seems incredible. That she might have conversed with Satan if he was otherwise manifested does not, when all the facts are taken into account, seem unbelievable.

The word translated serpent in Gen. iii. 1 is from the Hebrew word *nachash,* meaning "the shining one." In the New Testament this serpent that beguiled Eve is said to be able to transform himself into "an angel of light" (2 Cor. xi. 14). He is called Lucifer, the light bringer, and a passage in Genesis (iii. 1) may be thus rendered: Satan was, "more wise than any living creature which Jehovah Elohim had made."

So that when Satan is spoken of as a serpent it no more need mean a literal snake than Judah, when called a lion's whelp, means a literal lion's whelp; or than Herod when called a fox, means a literal fox.

The words: "And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan," would seem to settle any possible doubt that the word serpent, employed in the account of the temptation of Eve, is a figure of rhetoric and is used to symbolize Satan. The additional descriptions—

"Upon thy belly shalt thou go and dust shalt thou eat," and the seed of the woman "shall bruise thy head" are also figures of speech used to intensify the literal fact, which is the ultimate disgusting humiliation and final defeat of Satan whose diabolical plots and purposes shall be crushed and ground at length under the heel of the *Son of Man.*

L. T. T.

IMPURE MILK FOR BABES.

It seems like petty despotism for a government to potter about a farmer's stable; fussing about the health of his cows, their, stalls, their food; the milk-pail, and the clean or unclean hands of the male milk-maid. The milk never passes from under government oversight until it passes into the hands of the consumer. The State is vitally interested in the death-rate of babies; they are its prospective citizens. Impure milk means death to many babies. The milk inspector is conserving the future of the State when he aids in making it impossible for an unscrupulous villain to poison a baby for a fraction of a cent profit on a quart of milk.

The Church, like the State, has a vital

interest in the child. "Sincere milk of the word" is provided for it that it "may grow thereby." The Revised Version renders it thus: "As new-born babes, long for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation." (2 Peter ii. 2.) This spiritual milk is the unadulterated Word of God. Every precaution possible has been taken by the Church to protect the child. The pastor is pledged "to instruct the youth." The superintendent is chosen for special qualifications of life, character and ability to teach children. The teacher is chosen by the superintendent and pastor with great care. Infidel views of the Scriptures would be as certain a bar to either position as an impure life. Every precaution is taken to make it impossible to put into the hands of the child literature contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures.

"The Methodist General Conference of 1912 ordered 'That those who are in charge of our official publications should consistently adhere to a cautious and wise policy during these times of unrest.' Such a policy should include the avoidance of unsettled questions so far as is consistent with honesty in teaching. If tentative views are set forth, they should be plainly labeled 'tentative.' Care should be taken to keep the teachings of our literature in harmony with the fundamental doctrines of Evangelical Christianity and the standards of the Methodist Episcopal Church."

The Presbyterian Church, after along discussion and most thorough examination, ordered its Sunday Schools to discontiue the Graded Lessons because of their doctrinal errors. We suggest to our readers that they keep close and faithful watch upon all Sunday School literature used in their schools. Any attempt to teach anything which is not in harmony with the fundamental doctrines of Evangelical Christianity, they are solicited to report to THE CHAMPION. The eagerness of the unscrupulous milk-dealer to evade the regulations which assure pure milk is not to be compared with that of the Modern Mind to sneak false teaching into Evangelical Sunday Schools. Courtesy is construed as fear. As you value your child, so deal with him who seeks to lead it astray. "Lightning does not strike twice in the same place," the boy said, "because it don't need to."

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

The Bibliotheca Sacra is to be congratulated upon its long and brilliant career. It has no superior in the character of the subjects treated, and for the intellectual ability and literary rank of its contributors. The editor, G. Frederick Wright, LL.D., alone, is enough to make the Quarterly one of the foremost leaders of the world in the realm which has commanded the interest and labor of his whole life. THE BIBLE CHAMPION is not only highly honored, but greatly favored in entering upon its work under the new name and under the direction of its new Board of Directors in being associated with *The Bibliotheca Sacra*. All new subscribers to *The Bibliotheca Sacra* may secure both magazines for one year for $3.00. This should be paid in advance and sent to THE BIBLE CHAMPION.

NO JULY CHAMPION.

THE CHAMPION is printed in a college town. June is the month when everything pertaining to college life and work must have precedence over all else. The June CHAMPION was unavoidably delayed, and was a month late to many, if not most, of our readers. To avoid issuing two magazines in one month, we omit July and date this number August, and make it the first number of the new volume as we did last year. The date of all subscribers will be advanced one month, so there will be no loss.

The very striking article by Judge Lamb, reprinted as a Bible League Tract from *The Biblotheca Sacra,* should be read by all our readers. It shows in a very significant manner the potent value of jural science and its methods in demonstrating the falsity of the hostile attacks of Higher Critics upon the Bible. It is a review of Hume and M'Giffert. The tract will be sent to any address for five cents in stamps.

The man who arrogates to himself the right to criticise God's Word, assumes that he is greater than the author of the Book he criticises. Men who do not believe in the inspiration of the Bible, have no sort of trouble in believing in their own inspiration.

Works by Rev. David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D.

The Wonderful Teacher

"Dr. Burrell has written the direct and forcible book one would expect from him. He delights to deal with the destructive criticism of the Bible, and is at home in the field of polemics. 'The Wonderful Teacher' is calculated to confirm the faith of Christians in the divine origin and authority of the Word, and is adapted to the average comprehension."—*New York Examiner.*

"The book is a fresh tribute to the Master, and is calculated to win Him new friends, and to strengthen and enlighten the faith of those who already believe in Him. Dr. Burrell strips the mask off all false theories that parade as the Gospel. He has a profound respect for every 'thus saith the Lord.' This book magnifies the Master and calls out a new appreciation of His divine teachings"—*Observer.*

Cloth, 327 pp. $1.20

The Teachings of Jesus Concerning the Scriptures

"This book should silence doubt and prove a splendid tonic to the hesitating. It is a language that any average reader can comprehend; the thought is scholarly but not scholastic, and the arguments so absolutely convincing as to make the knowing critic wince and the ignorant critic clearly see the way. It would be hard to name a better book to place into the hands of either believer or doubter who desires true light upon the vitally important question which it discusses."—*Presbyterian.*

Cloth, 211 pp. $.75

The Old-Time Religion

"We always delight to get a book written by Dr. Burrell. It is sure to be loyal to the Word of God and fitted for the needs of men. Dr. Burrell is one of the greatest illustrations living of the power of the old gospel to draw, to keep and save. Get the book and taste the clusters of rich grapes in the hands of this man of God. Every page is fresh, stimulating, instructive and helpful."—*Watchword and Truth.*

Cloth, 349 pp. $1 00

The Sermon: Its Construction and Delivery

"Dr. Burrell is a master of the art of preaching. He is a fine illustration of his own teaching. It has about it the charm of spoken discourse. There is not a dry page in it, and, so far as we have been able to judge, not an inconsequential sentence."—*The Examiner.*

Cloth, 329 pp. $1.50

Address,

BIBLE LEAGUE, 317 EAST 118th ST. NEW YORK CITY